2004

Factors underlying stalking and harassing behavior in a college population

Jill Johansson-Love
West Virginia University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Johansson-Love, Jill, "Factors underlying stalking and harassing behavior in a college population" (2004). *Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports*. 2042.
<https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd/2042>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by the The Research Repository @ WVU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you must obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in WVU Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports collection by an authorized administrator of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact researchrepository@mail.wvu.edu.

Factors Underlying Stalking and Harassing Behavior in a College Population

Jill Johansson-Love

Thesis submitted to the
College of Arts and Sciences
at West Virginia University
in Partial Fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Science
in
Adult Clinical Psychology

William Fremouw, Ph. D., Chair
Stan Cohen, Ph. D.
Barry Edelstein, Ph. D.

Department of Psychology

Morgantown, West Virginia
2004

Keywords: stalking, harassing, unwanted pursuit behavior, cognitions, criminal thinking
styles

Abstract

Factors Underlying Stalking and Harassing Behavior in a College Population

Jill Johansson-Love

At the high end of unwanted pursuit behavior is stalking. This study, using questionnaires, investigated a sample of 48, college females, identified as potential stalkers. Factors examined included: demographic information, social desirability, psychological functioning, attachment, motive, rape myth acceptance, adversarial sexual beliefs, criminal thinking styles, and the actual unwanted pursuit behavior. Hypotheses regarding the criminal thinking styles of the individuals engaging in harassing and stalking behavior were supported at the .05 level. These findings indicate that harassers and stalkers exhibit criminal thinking patterns, such as sacrificing internal control to exert control over the external environment and justifying behavior by externalizing blame. Results also suggest that harassers through their distorted thinking grant themselves permission to disregard the law.

Acknowledgements

The successful completion of this study would not have been possible without the support and guidance of Dr. Fremouw, my committee chair. Thank you for your patience. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Stan Cohen, Dr. Barry Edelstein, and Dr. Deborah Jones, for their time and effort in reviewing my manuscript and for their suggestions and guidance. Finally I would like to thank my husband Michael Ryan Love and my family and friends (in Sweden and the United States), for their encouragement to follow my dream and their unconditional love.

Table of Contents

Title Page	
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Introduction	1
Definitions	1
Prevalence	4
Victim impact	4
Stalker characteristics	5
Stalker typologies	8
Stalking theories	9
Attachment theories	9
Social learning-motivation theories	11
Cognitive antecedents-attitudinal theories	12
Statement of the problem	14
Design	16
Hypotheses	16
Attachment	16
Motive	16
Cognition factors	17
Method	17
Participants	17

Measures	18
Demographic measures	18
Demographic Form	18
Criterion variable measure	18
Unwanted Pursuit Behavior Inventory.....	18
Dependent variable measures	19
Motive/ Reason for contact Questionnaire	19
Rape Myth Acceptance Scale	19
The Relationship Style Questionnaire	20
Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles.....	20
Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Modified.....	22
Potential co-variate measures	23
Symptom Checklist-90-Revised	23
Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale.....	24
Procedure	25
Results.....	27
Demographics	27
Social desirability.....	28
Psychological functioning.....	28
Attachment.....	29
Motivation.....	29
Cognitive factors	29
Discussion	31

Demographic variables	31
Attachment.....	32
Motivation.....	32
Cognitive factors.....	34
Conclusion of significant results.....	37
Limitations	38
Future directions	39
References.....	41
Appendices.....	48
Appendix A (Advertisement).....	48
Appendix B (Demographic form).....	49
Appendix C (UPBI)	53
Appendix D (Reason for contact)	56
Appendix E (verbal instructions).....	57
Appendix F (Informed Consent).....	58
Appendix G (Local mental health resources)	61
Tables	62
Table 1 (time since break-up, age, and race by group).....	62
Table 2 (Religious, number of relationships, and living situation by group)	63
Table 3 (Living location, work, class standing, alcohol, and drug use by group) .	64
Table 4 (Attachment style by group)	66
Table 5 (Motivation by group).....	67
Table 6 (RMA, and ASBM data by group).....	68

Table 7 (Criminal thinking styles by group).....	69
Table 8 (Content, Factor, and Special scales by group from the PICTS).....	70

Factors Underlying Stalking and Harassing Behavior in a College Population

Definitions

In 1990, California became the first state to establish anti-stalking laws after the murder of the actress Rebecca Schaeffer. Each state in the United States, as well as Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Great Britain, has since adopted anti-stalking laws (Meloy, 2003). While these laws differ slightly in the definition of stalking from state to state, Meloy (2000) has identified the following three common elements in a stalking law:

- 1) A pattern where the person engages in following or harassing behavior.
- 2) A credible threat from the stalker.
- 3) The victim experiences fear.

West Virginia's anti-stalking law, § 61-2-9a. includes the three components (a) "Any person who knowingly, willfully, and repeatedly follows... Harasses...and (b) makes a credible threat against a person with whom he or she has,.....had or.....seeks to establish a personal or social relationship, whether or not such intention is reciprocated,.....with the intent to place (c) that person in reasonable apprehension that he or she or a member of his or her immediate family will suffer death, bodily injury, sexual assault, battery or kidnapping,....." (Michie's West Virginia Code annotated, 2004).

The definitions of stalking for research purposes have frequently used the individual states' legal definitions (e.g. Fremouw, Westrup & Pennypacker, 1997) or have adapted a definition for the research population such as *unwanted pursuit behavior*, (UPB; Langhrichsen-Rohling, & Rohling, 2002; Davis, Ace, & Andra, 2000) and *obsessional relational intrusion*, (ORI; Cupach & Spitzberg, 1998). These definitions adapted for research utilize the first element identified by Meloy, a repeated pattern of overt behavior attempting to communicate with an

unwilling other. This overt behavior must be recognized as unwanted by the victim, if not by the perpetrator (Meloy & Gothard, 1995; Pathe' & Mullen, 1997), but does not always have to include a threat or create fear in the victim. Thus, definitions of stalking for research purposes form a continuum, ranging from the requirement of fear, to the absence of fear with only potentially frightening behavior patterns.

In a national seminal study, the National Violence Against Women (NVAW) telephone-surveyed 8,000 women and 8,000 men in the United States between November, 1995 and May, 1996, to assess the incidence and the types of stalking in the community (Tjaden, 1997, p. 1). This survey did not use the actual word stalking, but used the following behavioral definition: “a course of conduct directed at a specific person that involves repeated physical or visual proximity, nonconsensual communication, or verbal, written, or implied threats enough to produce fear in a reasonable individual” (Tjaden, 1997). This definition included all three elements, (a) course of conduct (b) credible threat, (c) victim fear. In a smaller survey study of college students that same year, Fremouw, Westrup and Pennypacker (1997) utilized a definition only requiring two elements: “Have you ever been stalked, defined as having someone knowingly and repeatedly following, harassing or threatening you?” Therefore, fear on the part of the victim did not have to be present to meet the definition of a victim of stalking in the study.

In an early article, Meloy and Gothard (1995) conceptualized stalking as *obsessional following*, as “an abnormal or long term pattern of threat or harassment directed toward a specific individual.” Again, fear was not a required component. A less threatening terminology for stalking is unwanted pursuit behavior (UPB), broadly defined by Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Palarea, Cohen and Rohling (2000) as “activities that constitute ongoing and unwanted pursuit of a romantic relationship between individuals who are not currently involved in a consensual

romantic relationship with each other.” This definition omits both credible threat and fear. However, the UPB inventory (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, & Rohling, 2002) includes items that if endorsed multiple times and if victim fear was assessed would constitute severe forms of stalking, such as “Have you ever had forced sex with your ex-partner after breaking up?” and “Have you ever threatened to harm your ex-partner with a weapon?”. The unwanted pursuit behavior definition is conceptually similar to obsessive relational intrusion (ORI), a mild stalking phenomenon defined as a “repeated and unwanted pursuit and invasion of one’s sense of physical or symbolic privacy by another person, either a stranger or acquaintance, who desires and/or presumes an intimate relationship” (Cupach & Spitzberg, 1998, p. 234-235). Thus, there are several definitions of stalking in the current literature: (a) legal, (b) research with 3 components (Tjaden, 1997), (c) research with 2 components (Fremouw, Westrup & Pennypacker, 1997; Meloy & Gothard, 1995) and (d) research with 1 component which use terms such as ORI and UPB (Cupach & Spitzberg, 1998; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Palarea, Cohen, & Rohling, 2000) instead of stalking.

All of the different definitions have a use in designated areas. The three component definitions are mainly used with in the legal system, with forensic (arrested/convicted) samples and with victims in the legal system (Tjaden, 1997; Wright, Burgess, Laszlo, McCrary, & Douglas, 1996). The two component sample can be used with victim samples in a non forensic population such as ex-partners in a college population (Fremouw, Westrup and Pennypacker, 1997). The victims are able to report the pattern of unwanted behavior directed towards them as well as on their own experience of fear, whether this fear is of a legally reasonable nature cannot be assessed without the involvement of the courts. The use of the one component definitions can be used with perpetrator in a non-forensic sample such as college students. When using measures

such as the UPB inventory persons can report what pattern of unwanted pursuit behavior they have engaged in towards another, but it does not require an assessment of victim fear, or whether the threat meets legal standard.

Prevalence

The magnitude of stalking depends upon the definition used. Using the stricter, three component definition the results of the NVAW survey revealed an 8% and 2% victim lifetime prevalence of stalking victimization for females and males respectively (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). It was also reported that the lifetime prevalence rate of being a stalking victim showed a large increase from 8% to 12% (females) and from 2% to 4% (males) if the fear component in the definition is decreased from “*frightened*” to “*somewhat frightened*” or a “*little frightened*”. Using a broader, 2-component definition of stalking, Fremouw and colleagues (1997) reported a 27% (female) and 17% (male) lifetime prevalence of stalking victimization.

A meta analysis of 103 stalking studies (both victim and perpetrator studies) across 108 samples, reported a 23.5% prevalence for females and a 10.5% lifetime prevalence for males (Spitzberg, 2002). These studies generally used the broader 1 or 2-component definitions. The use of different 3, 2 and 1-component definitions of stalking can be assumed to account for some of the variation in prevalence rates between different samples. However, even when based on the conservative NVAW survey, the estimated numbers of stalking victims are staggering, 1,006,970 females and 370,990 males are stalked annually. Adults between 18 and 29 years old account for 52% of the victims (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998).

Victim impact

It is not only the high prevalence that make stalking an important target for research; stalking is an enduring behavior which can create much suffering and long lasting impact in the

victim's life. The NVAW survey revealed a mean duration of 1.8 years for the stalking behavior. If a distinction is made between stalking of partners versus non-partners, the duration changes to 2.2 years and 1.1 years, respectively (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). One third of the female victims and one fifth of the male victims reported that the stalking left them in the need for psychological services. The majority of the victims surveyed reported being concerned with their safety; 56% of the women and 51% of the men took some measure to protect themselves as a result of the stalking, and 26% had been absent from work because of it (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998).

To quantify the potential impact of stalking, Westrup, Fremouw, Thompson & Lewis (1999) were the first to assess the effects of stalking using standardized psychological measures and a control group. The Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Scale (Foa, 1995), the Symptom Checklist-90-R (Derogatis, 1977) and the Self-Report Interpersonal Trust Scale (McDonald, Kessel & Fuller, 1972) were administered to college females (stalking/harassed victims and controls). The results supported the hypothesis that victims of stalking exhibit quantifiably significant negative psychological effects. Even in the college population, where it is more likely for a person to have experienced the milder forms of stalking, significantly more PTSD symptoms were endorsed by females that had been stalked than either a harassed group or a control group (Westrup et al., 1999). Previously, Mullen and Path9 (1997) also reported the negative impact of stalking on 100 victims, but did not include a control condition nor standardized measures.

Stalker characteristics

Epidemiological research, as reviewed in Spitzberg's (2002) meta analysis, has primarily surveyed self-reported victims, not stalkers, and used mixed gender populations. The studies have incorporated a variety of populations, including clinical/forensic (41%), general

population/community (34%) and college (25%) samples (Spitzberg, 2002). The early stalking research utilized forensic-clinical samples to establish a typology of stalkers. For example, Zona, Sharma, & Lane (1993) grouped 74 arrested stalkers into three categories based on their case files, erotomaniacs (diagnosed with erotomanic delusional disorder and stalked strangers), love obsessives (had a psychiatric disorder and stalked strangers) and simple obsessives (had some type of prior relationship with their victim). The erotomanic subtype of delusional disorder involve a person who is delusional and believes that another person is in love with them, the person who is the subject of the delusion is often of higher status than the person experiencing the delusions (American Psychiatric Association, Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders IV-text revised, 2000) Unfortunately, interrater reliabilities were not reported, nor was it reported how the cases were categorized into these groups. This study concluded that the simple obsessive category was the most common type of stalker (47%). In a later study by Zona, Palarea and Lane (1998) of 200 case files, an increasing number, 65% of the sample, was categorized as the simple obsessive type. This finding further suggests that the simple obsessive stalker is the most common category of stalkers.

Using a general community population sample, the NVAW's (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998) national survey indicated that an ex-partner stalked 59% of the female and 30% of the male victims. The study also revealed that 43% of the partner stalking incidents took place after the dissolution of the relationship and that 36% occurred both before and after the relationship. They (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998) also reported the victim's impressions of why the stalking behavior ceased: 19% said that they (the victim) moved, 18% reported that the stalker found a new love, 15% of stalkers terminated the behavior after a warning from authorities, 10 % stopped after the victim talked to the stalker, 9% ceased because the stalker was arrested and 7% said that their

stalker moved. The three major motives for the stalking, as perceived by the victims, were (a) control (21%), (b) reconciliation (20%), and (c) intimidation (16%).

The emerging data suggest that the majority of stalking cases are not perpetrated by felons with severe pathology, such as Zona's sample, but by ex-partners. This finding may have prompted the increasing number of studies using a college sample (Davis, Ace & Andra, 2000; Fremouw, Westrup & Pennypacker, 1997; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Palarea, Cohen and Rohling, 2000; Lewis, Fremouw, Del Ben & Farr, 2001; Sinclair & Frieze, 2002). Fremouw et al., (1997) using a college sample, reported that only three males (2.3%) and no females, from a sample of 600, reported having engaged in stalking. Because the actual term "stalking" was used in the questionnaire it probably influenced the subjects to give a socially desirable answer: the denial of the behavior.

Identifying stalkers outside the legal and forensic settings is difficult and has prompted the development of less stigmatizing terminology to permit individuals who engage in these behaviors to identify themselves without being labeled as "stalkers". Later studies, which have avoided using the term stalking, have produced significantly larger groups of self-identified stalkers (i.e. persons admitting to engaging in behaviors that could be labeled as stalking). Lewis et al. (2001) used endorsements on a list of stalking behaviors developed by Coleman (1997) to identify 22 (9%) stalkers, half male and half female from a total population of 240 college students. Sinclair and Frieze (2002) focused on unhappy love and crushes and devised a courtship behavior list that included approach, surveillance, intimidation, attempts to hurt self, aggression, and extreme harm items. All of the aforementioned items could, based on the frequency of occurrence, be labeled as stalking. They found that 18% of the students reported having engaged in "aggressive behavior" to get their love-interest's attention, and another 18%

reported having “gone too far” in their pursuit of attention. The same study used factor-derived scales instead of single items and reported that on at least one occasion 30% of men and 28% of women used intimidation. Twenty-five percent of women and 19% of men used verbal aggression. Physically violent behavior directed toward the love-interest or towards a third party was used by 14% of women and by 12% of men.

Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. (2000) studied college students who had a break up, distinguishing between the initiator of the break-up and the receiver of the break-up. Almost 28 % of the receivers reportedly engaged in at least one behavior that had a negative impact on the initiator, but only 3.3% reported any serious pursuit behavior (i.e., threats or damage to property). These “unrequited lovers” or the receivers of the break-ups did not always realize that their behavior could be seen as stalking and that even the milder forms of their behavior could have a negative impact on their victim. In fact, some even interpreted their behavior as positive (Sinclair & Frieze, 2002). This inability of stalkers/unrequited lovers to see the actual negative effect of their own actions might be contributing to their low endorsement rates when the word stalking is used.

Stalker typologies

Beginning with Zona (1993), many researchers have attempted to develop typologies of stalkers. Meloy (1996) reviewed ten published studies of clinical and forensic samples and described a demographic profile of stalkers as 72% male and 35-40 years old. Seventy-five percent did not have a partner at the time and about half of them had never been married or were divorced. Stalkers were under-employed or unemployed, but better educated than other criminals. Zona (1993) reported that the largest category of stalkers, “simple obsessional”, did not have a criminal history. Meloy and Gothard (1995) however, reported that stalkers were

likely to have a criminal history. Most recently, Mullen, Pathé, and Purcell (2000) presented a five category typology of stalkers (the majority of which were court referred) based on (a) the motive of the stalking and (b) the context of how the stalking begun. The primary types were:

- 1) The rejected (reacting to an unwelcome break-up to get back together).
- 2) The intimacy seeking (responding to loneliness and are trying to establish a relationship).
- 3) The resentful (responding to an insult or injury to themselves and act for vindication).
- 4) The predatory (pursuit for sexual gratification and control of the other).
- 5) The incompetent (choosing less adaptive behaviors for their role as a suitor).

In their model, psychiatric status and the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim lead to predictions of the duration and nature of the stalking behavior. However, these predictions are not yet validated, nor have their variables of psychiatric status and prior relationship between perpetrator and victim demonstrated reliability.

Stalking Theories

Attachment theories

In a non-forensic sample, it is unclear why some individuals stalk, threaten, and harass an ex-intimate after a relationship ends, and why most others do not engage in these behaviors.

What are the relationship and/or individual characteristics that differentiate a stalker from non-stalker? Meloy (2003) has theorized that an insecure attachment style and unmet needs form the basis of stalking behavior. Attachment has been investigated for a long time in the research literature starting with Bowlby (1951) when he examined the effects of maternal love on the mental development of postwar European children. Later Bowlby (1971) and (Ainsworth, Blehar, Walters, & Wall, 1978) defined the term attachment as a lasting affective relationship between a child and persons with whom the child interacts on a regular basis. Three types of

attachments in infants (avoidant, secure & ambivalent/resistant) have prevailed in research for decades (Ainsworth et al., 1978). Criteria for a fourth attachment style, the disorganized/disoriented, have since been developed (Maine & Solomon, 1986, 1990). The adult styles were developed as a continuation of the infant attachment styles. Bartholomew (1990, 1994, & 1997) proposed three pathological adult attachment styles:

1. Persons with *preoccupied attachment* view themselves negatively and others positively. They act very dependent while trying to be accepted by others.
2. People with *fearful attachment* have a negative view of themselves as well as others. They want to be accepted but avoid others for fear of rejection.
3. Persons with *dismissing attachment* are categorized by a positive view of themselves but a negative view of others. They avoid intimacy with others to keep their independence and invulnerability.

As with the infant literature on attachment, a fourth attachment style, disorganized, has been added to the adult model. This fourth attachment style has limited research support and is mostly apparent in forensic and very disturbed populations (Fonagy, 1999).

Having a secure attachment can act as a protective shield for children from an impoverished social and economic environment against the impact of family violence (Meloy, 2003). Having an insecure attachment can, however, increase the risk of being criminally violent (Meloy, 2003). Insecure (i.e., pathological) attachment has been linked in several studies to relationship violence (Dutton, 1999; Holtzworth-Munroe, Stuart & Hutchison 1997; Tweed & Dutton, 1998; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000).

Attachment has been studied in stalkers. For example, Lewis, Fremouw, Del Ben, and Farr (2001) found that college stalkers had significantly more insecure attachment and borderline

personality disorder features than control groups. The self-identified male stalkers also had significantly less developed problem solving skills and cognitive flexibility when compared to male controls. Unexpectedly, female self-identified stalkers had better problem solving skills than the female controls. It was also reported that there was not a significant difference between the self-identified stalkers and the controls on empathy and affective sensitivity. Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. (2000) assessed relationship specific attachment, using an adaptation of the Spouse-Specific Dependency Scale (SSDS; Rathus & O’Leary, 1997), as well as the general attachment style, measured by “Experiences in Close Relationships” (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998). Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. (2000) reported that attachment and partner specific dependency/attachment predicted the severity index on the UPB inventory. Break-up sufferers that were insecurely attached to their ex-partner were more likely to engage in unwanted pursuit behavior. These individuals also reported more nurturance-and support-seeking, possessive and dependent behavior. Attachment does appear, based on the previous literature, to be an important variable to include when investigating individuals that engage in unwanted pursuit behavior.

Social learning –motivation theories

Westrup, and Fremouw (1998) conceptualized stalking behaviors, not based on psychodynamic processes of attachment, but as a social-learning phenomenon. Using the paradigm of functional analysis, they discussed stalking as a learned behavior with antecedents (attachment style, break-up) and consequences (attention from the victim, reconciliation, rejection).

Consistent with a functional analytic view, a national survey (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998) asked victims their perspective of the stalkers’ motivations or what is reinforcing/maintaining the stalking. This was the first attempt to identify the motivation for the stalking behavior. The victims in this survey identified three major motives: control (21%), reconciliation (20%), and

intimidation (16%). Sinclair and Frieze (2002) assessed the initial motive of self-identified stalkers by asking them to endorse how much a statement pertained to their feelings when they were rejected by their love interest. For males, feeling vengeful, deceived or wanting to hurt the other were all correlated with intimidation, approach behavior, surveillance, mild and severe aggression. Refusing to take “no” for an answer was correlated with approach behavior and intimidation. Being angry and depressed over the rejection was commonly correlated with mild aggression, intimidation and hurting oneself. They reported a similar correlation pattern for females.

Purcell, Pathé and Mullen (2001) investigated the motives of a subgroup of female stalkers ($n = 40$) in a forensic sample. Using the five categories from Mullen, Pathé, and Purcell (2000) motive typology of stalkers, they reported that 45% ($n = 18$) of the female stalkers were categorized as “intimacy seekers”. Twenty-five percent ($n = 10$) were classified as “rejected”, 18% ($n = 7$) were “resentful” and 10% ($n = 4$) were deemed “incompetent”. There were no female stalkers that could be categorized in the “predatory” category. Their definitions, rating procedures and reliability were, however, not reported.

Very little research has assessed the perpetrators’ self stated motive/anticipated reinforcement for his/her stalking behavior or examined whether the motivation may evolve or change over time. For example, a recently broken up ex-partner may initially seek reconciliation, but might after further dismissal change his/her motive to revenge. The assessment of the self-reported motive and its possible change is a logical extension of Westrup and Fremouw (1998) social learning approach to explaining stalking behavior.

Cognitive antecedents- attitudinal theories.

Examining stalking behavior using a functional analysis reveals some largely unexplored areas. In the current A-B-C model, there are several established antecedents such as rejection and insecure attachment that set the stage and precede the stalking behavior. The motive, also an antecedent, may dictate what form the stalking behavior will assume. Then there is the actual behavior of stalking. The consequences or reinforcement are factors such as attention and possible reconciliation that maintain the behavior. An area that appears to have been overlooked in the current literature is the stalkers' cognitions and potential cognitive distortions. What are the thoughts and attitudes of a person prior to engaging in stalking behavior as compared to a person who does not engage in these behaviors? Cognitions may be antecedents to the behavior, but cognitive distortions may also be involved in maintaining the behavior. In the depression literature cognitive distortions have been linked to behavior. The distortions can be treated using cognitive restructuring which leads to a decrease in both cognitive distortions and depressive symptoms. Insight into the cognitions and potential distortions acting as antecedents and maintaining the behavior may be helpful in treatment and should be included in the classification of persons engaging in stalking behavior.

In other forensic offender areas cognitions have been included. Abel, Becker & Cunningham-Rathner (1984) identified cognitive distortions that underlie sexual abuse offenses where perpetrators are romanticizing and justifying their aberrant sexual abuse of children. Similarly, some rapists show cognitive distortions in their views of women. Burt (1980) designed a widely used measure of false beliefs about females called the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale. Burt defines rape myths as "prejudicial, stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape victims, and rapists" (Burt, 1980, p.217). Endorsing rape myths such as; "Any healthy woman can successfully resist a rapist if she really wants to" (Burt, 1980, p.217), have been found to relate

to men's self reported intent to rape (Breire & Malamuth, 1983; Hamilton & Yee, 1990; Malamuth, 1981). High levels of agreement with rape myths have also been found in self-reported rapists, (Malamuth, 1981).

In their stalking research, Sinclair and Frieze (2002) adapted Burt's nine-item subscale of adversarial sexual beliefs (Burt, 1980) and used it with a college sample. A five-point Likert scale was incorporated instead of the original seven-point scale. Two items were added to the scale from the acceptance of interpersonal violence scale (Burt, 1980). The authors also added seven additional items that they constructed to further address any adversarial attitudes. This study reported that scores on this scale were positively correlated with approach behavior, surveillance, and intimidation for males, but only with intimidation for females. Thus, these cognitive factors and measures correlate well with unwanted pursuit behaviors. Clearly, there is a need for further research.

The Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles, (PICTS; Walters, 1995) is reported to measure thinking styles associated with serious criminal behavior using eight different thinking patterns. The study used an adaptation of this measure and applied it to a population of college students engaging in UPB. The thinking styles of most interest as related to UPB are, a) mollification (justifying the behavior by externalizing the blame on to others), b) entitlement (engaging in the behavior because they are entitled, have a sense of ownership and give themselves permission to disregard the laws and rights of others), and c) power orientation (these people are assumed to be reinforced by power and control over others).

Statement of the Problem

The present study examined unwanted pursuit behavior in female college students who recently experienced a break-up of a serious and intimate relationship (potential stalkers),

replicating part of the methodology of Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. (2000). The UPB inventory, which was used with a college sample of individuals who had recently experienced a break-up in the Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. (2000), was utilized in the present study as the criterion measure. A college sample was hypothesized to be more likely to engage in unwanted pursuit behaviors at the milder end of the stalking continuum than a forensic sample. The meta analysis of stalking by Spitzberg (2002) justified the decision to use persons who have recently been in an intimate relationship by reporting that across studies, 49% of stalking originated from a previously romantic relationship. The present study also wanted to investigate potential gender differences between males and females engaging in stalking behavior. The findings are mixed with regard to gender differences among stalking perpetrators (Davis & Hanson Frieze, 2000). Male perpetration seems, overall, more highly reported than female. However, there are some potential problems with these data. Stalking behavior/unwanted pursuit behavior coming from a female toward a male might not be as threatening to a male as it would be if the same behavior was directed toward a female by a male (Davis, Ace & Andra, 1999). This, in turn, might impact victim reports. The present study aimed at investigating gender differences in the perpetrators self-reported behavior.

The SCL-90-R (Derogatis, 1994) was included in this study to examine potential pathology differences in the participants using the global severity index. A measure of social desirability, the Marlow-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCDS; Crowne & Marlow, 1960), was also included to investigate any potential group differences in socially desirable responding to measures.

The current study attempted to replicate findings on attachment, it has been previously reported that persons engaging stalking behavior (both males and females) have significantly

higher levels of insecure attachment (Lewis et al., 2001). The current study also attempted to further the investigation of motive of stalking. Previous studies (Mullen, Path9, & Purcell, 2000; Purcell, Path9 & Mullen, 2001) have grouped individuals into predetermined motive categories based on their forensic files. This study had the person identify the motive category or state the motive for their behavior. This study also attempted to replicate the findings of Sinclair and Frieze (2002), using their adapted version of Burt's nine-item scale of adversarial sexual beliefs (Burt, 1980), indicating that endorsing these attitudes was correlated with intimidation for females and with both intimidation and surveillance for males. The present study also attempted to extend the stalking research literature by investigating cognitive factors such as criminal thinking styles (Walters, 2001), hitherto unexamined with persons engaging in stalking.

Design

The present study examined a female sample, who had all been broken up with, within the last year. The stalking and harassing groups were compared to each other, as well as to the control group, on all independent variables, basic demographic variables and potential co-variates. There were five dependent variables used (attachment, motive, rape myth acceptance, adversarial sexual beliefs modified, and psychological inventory of criminal thinking styles).

Hypotheses

Attachment

It was hypothesized that persons in the stalking and harassing groups would have a higher percentage of insecure attachment than the persons in the control group (Lewis et al., 2001).

Motivation

It was hypothesized that there would be gender differences with regards to motives but these could not be assessed in the present sample, and the analysis of the motives was therefore only exploratory (Mullen, Path9, & Purcell, 2000; Purcell, Path9 & Mullen, 2001).

Cognitive factors

Stalkers and harassers were hypothesized to score higher on the RMA (i.e., endorse more rape myths) and the ASBM (i.e., endorse more adversarial sexual beliefs) than controls (Sinclair & Frieze, 2002).

Stalkers and harassers were hypothesized to score higher on the PICTS in three of the thinking styles (mollification, power orientation, & entitlement; Walters, 2001) than controls.

Method

Participants

The participants were recruited from undergraduate psychology classes and earned extra credit points for research participation. The total sample for this study was 211 after 12 participants were excluded for missing data or not fulfilling the recruitment criteria. Four additional participants were excluded based on their sexual preference because all participants were to be heterosexual; three participants were self-reported homosexual and one was self-reported bisexual. Of the 207 participants included in the final sample, 137 (66.2%) indicated that they had initiated the break-up and 70 (33.8%) said that they were the receiver of the break-up. The sample of break-up receivers was of interest in the present study because these participants are the potential stalkers. There were 22 (31.4%) males and 48 (68.6%) females in this sample. Because of the small sample of male participants, controls ($n = 14$), harassers ($n = 5$), Stalking ($n = 3$) the subsequent results are based on only the female sample.

The students were recruited using bulletin boards in the Life Science Building, as well as announcements in the different sections of introductory psychology classes. The note (see Appendix A) asked for study participants who had experienced a break-up of a serious, intimate relationship within the last 12 months. The descriptor “serious” was operationally defined as a relationship lasting over one month as in the Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. (2000) study and “intimate” was operationally defined as partners engaged in some form of sexual contact. The information provided by the participants was anonymous. Consistent with IRB guidelines, fully informed voluntary consent was obtained before any research participation.

Measures

Demographic Measures

Demographic form. This questionnaire (see Appendix B) obtained basic demographic information such as age, race, gender, relationship status, on or off campus residence, religion, substance use, and education level.

Criterion Variable Measure

Unwanted Pursuit Behavior Inventory (UPBI; Palarea & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1998). This is a 26-item self-report measure (see Appendix C) of unwanted pursuit behaviors ranging from unwanted phone messages to kidnap/hold against person’s will. This assessed the presence of pursuit behavior as well as its severity level. The authors devised the measure after a review of the literature as well as an assessment of the behaviors of stalkers from the Los Angeles Police Department’s Treatment Unit. This measure was not published in 1998 but used in a subsequent study by Langhinrichsen-Rohling, et al. (2000). They reported a coefficient alpha of .81 for a sample of potential victims and stalkers in a college population.

Dependent Variable Measures

Motive Questionnaire. This questionnaire was devised by the author to assess the self-reported motive of individuals engaging in harassing and stalking behavior. It asked whether they tried to contact the ex-partner after the break-up and then listed 10 possible reasons for the contact as well as an “other” option where the person could write another reason. The next question assessed if the motive changed and how long after. Again the 11 alternatives were presented to the participant. The last question was an attempt to assess if the contact had stopped and why (see Appendix D). The reasons in the motive questionnaire were based on four (intimacy seeking, rejected, resentful and predatory) of the five motivational types identified by Mullen et al. (2000). The incompetent type was not included. The definition of the intimacy seeking type supported the statements “because I was lonely” and “in an attempt to stay friends”. The rejected type supported the statements “in an attempt to win him/her back” and “to get an explanation”. The resentful type supported the use of statements such as “to settle some issues” and “for revenge”. Lastly the predatory type supported utilizing statements such as “to check that there wasn’t anyone else there” and “because I wanted to scare him or her”

Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMA scale; Burt, 1980). This scale consists of 19 items designed to measure the participant’s overall level of agreement with rape myths. Rape myths are statements that generally suggest that rape victims are to blame and/or bring about the rape by their own actions. High agreement with rape myths have been positively correlated with sexual conservatism, adversarial sexual beliefs, acceptance of interpersonal violence (Burt, 1980), and self-reported likelihood of committing rape (Briere & Malamuth, 1983). Rape myth acceptance scores were also significantly higher in self-reported rapists (Malamuth, 1981). The Burt (1980) scale use a seven-point Likert scale for eleven items, a four-point scale for two items

and a five-point scale for the final six. The Rape Myth Acceptance Scale has a reported Cronbach's alpha of .88 and item to total correlations ranging from .27 to .62 Burt (1980). This study administered the RMA scale in its original format.

The Relationship Style Questionnaire (RSQ; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994). This is a 30-item self-report measure that is designed to indicate the respondent's attachment style. There are four possible attachment styles: secure, fearful, preoccupied, and dismissing. This measure utilizes a five point Likert scale ranging from one, "not at all like me" to five, "very much like me". This measure is scored with a template that indicates which items corresponds to a certain attachment style. Items such as "I find it difficult to depend on other people" would score on the fearful attachment style, items such as "I am comfortable having other people depend on me" would count toward the secure attachment style, "I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others" would count on the preoccupied and "It is very important to me to feel self-sufficient" would count toward the dismissing attachment style. The RSQ was developed using prior measures of attachment styles by Griffin and Bartholomew (1994). They reported the internal consistency of the RSQ with alphas ranging from .41 (secure attachment) to .70 (dismissing attachment). Convergent validity was also assessed using the RSQ and interview ratings of attachment style. The coefficients reported ranged from .25 (secure attachment) to .47 (dismissing attachment).

Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS; Walters, 2001). This is an 80-item self-report measure, intended to be used in the correctional system. A four point Likert scale is utilized ranging from "strongly agree" to "disagree". This measure assesses eight different thinking styles that are theorized to maintain a criminal life style: Mollification (justifying the behavior by externalizing the blame on to others), Cutoff (indicates impulsive

behavior and disregard of the deterrents), Entitlement (engaging in the behavior because they are entitled, have a sense of ownership and give themselves permission to disregard the laws and rights of others. The fourth thinking pattern is Power Orientation (these people need power and control over others), Sentimentality (belief in that any good deed even an unrelated one can erase the harm done), Superoptimism (thinking that they will be able to escape or postpone the known negative consequences of their behavior). The seventh thinking style is Cognitive Indolence (take shortcuts around problems) and the eight-style is Discontinuity (lack of continuity in behavior, losing sight of the initial goals of the behavior). The PICTS also gives you two content scales the current and historical criminal thinking scales. The Current Criminal Thinking scale indicates a person who identifies with a criminal belief system and is a good predictor of criminal recidivism. The Historical Criminal Thinking scale indicates a person who has previously had a criminal belief system. There are also four factor scales: Problem Avoidance (correlate highly with four other scales so may not contribute much; indicative of a person who shy away from problems into criminal activity), Interpersonal Hostility (rarely endorsed and may be indicative of severe hostility bordering on confusion), Self-Assertion (a person who force their will on others to get their way no matter who gets hurt), and Denial of Harm (minimizing the harm produced by one's criminal behavior). The last scale on the PICTS is the Fear of Change special scale (assumed to be indicative of a person who has some concerns and fears about changing their behavior) Walters (2001) examined the internal consistency and found no significant variation due to gender, males and females showed similar patterns. The internal consistency of the PICTS was reported with moderate to high with alphas ranging from .54 to .88. Inter-item correlations ranged from .13 to .39. Test-retest reliability was reported to exceed .70 after two weeks and after twelve weeks to be above .50, (except for three scales for women;

Mollification $r = .48$, Cutoff $r = .47$, Interpersonal Hostility scale $r = .48$).

Walters (2001) assessed the concurrent criterion related validity of the PICTS's scales by correlating them to historical factors of criminality such as prior arrests, prior incarcerations, age at first arrest and age at first incarceration. The correlation coefficients for the PICTS's scales ranged from .04 to .22 with prior arrests, from -.03 to .23 with prior commitments, -.15 to -.32 with age at first arrest, and from -.13 to .33 with age at first commitment. To further assess the concurrent criterion related validity, Walters (2001) correlated the PICTS to two other commonly used measures of criminal antisocial status, the Lifestyle Criminality Screening form (LCSF-R: Walters, 1998 & Walters et al., 1991) and Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL-R: Hare, 1991). Moderate correlations were found. The PICTS scores have discriminated between minimum, medium, and maximum security inmates. It has also shown the ability to predict disciplinary problems in a population of medium-security inmates (Walters, 1996). Hatch-Maillette, Scalora, Huss and Baumgartner (2001) report that the two of the PICTS scales (Entitlement and Cutoff) reliably differentiated between sex offenders and non-sex offenders. This measure has been slightly adapted in this study for use with a college population by exchanging the word crime with irresponsible behavior, defined as activities/behavior that could be labeled as illegal such as fighting, DUI, vandalism, and theft (the changes are available from the author see Appendix F for contact information).

Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Modified (ASBM; a combination of: Burt, 1980 & Sinclair & Frieze, 2002). This is a scale used by Sinclair and Frieze in a college population, of both males and females, and it combines the Adversarial Sexual Belief scale (Burt, 1980), two items from the Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence scale (Burt, 1980) and seven items devised by Sinclair and Frieze. The seven new items were included to highlight any sexist beliefs or suspicion

schema (which would take into account the instances where one person suspects the other to have feelings even though the person in question denies any feelings and will not take no for an answer). This is an eighteen-item scale that utilizes a five-point Likert scale. Sinclair & Frieze (2002) reports an alpha of .82 for this modified scale. They further reported that the predictive power of this modified version did not differ from the predictive power of the original scales. This modified scale was significantly correlated with approach, surveillance and intimidation in males and with intimidation in females.

Potential Co-Variate Measures

Symptom Checklist-90-R, SCL-90-R (Derogatis, 1994). This self-report measure is intended to measure symptom patterns associated with nine symptom dimensions (Somatization, Obsessive-Compulsive, Interpersonal Sensitivity, Depression, Anxiety, Hostility, Phobic Anxiety, Paranoid Ideation, and Psychotism). The SCL-90-R measures the current symptom and distress status, besides the nine symptom dimensions it has three global indices of distress (Global Severity Index, Positive Symptom Distress Index, and Positive Symptom Total). The SCL-90-R requires a sixth grade reading level and utilizes a five point Likert scale, from not at all to extremely. The internal consistency alphas for the nine symptom dimensions range from .77 (psychotism) to .90 (depression). The test retest reliability was assessed after a week in a sample of outpatients and the coefficients ranged from .80 to .90. in another reliability study the outpatients were assessed again after ten weeks and the coefficients still ranged between .68 and .83. The convergent and discriminate validity of the SCL-90-R has been investigated using the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-28) and the Young Adult Self-Report (YASR). Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) analysis showed that the YASR and the SCL-90-R performed in a similar fashion but both were significantly better than the GHQ-28 in detecting

psychopathology in young adults (18-25years). Peveler and Fairburn (1990) used diabetic and bulimic samples to correlate the SCL-90-R with the Present State Examination (PSE), a structured interview administered by a clinician. This study reported that the SCL-90-R had good concurrent validity with the PSE as an overall measure of psychopathology, as indicated by the .60 to .82 correlation coefficients. The SCL-90-R was also correlated with the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) and the Asberg Rating Scale to test the concurrent validity of the depression scale of the measure and yielded coefficients of .80 and .81 respectively (Asberg, Kragh-Sorensen, Mindham, & Tuck, 1973). The SCL-90-R was used in the current study to investigate potential differences between the groups utilizing the global severity index. This index is recommended in the SCL-90-R manual (Derogatis, 1994) as being the best indicator of psychological distress when one summary measure is used.

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, MCSDS (Crowne & Marlow, 1960). This measure contains thirty-three true-false statements. Marlowe and Crowne devised a scale of social desirability that did not have items that were drawn from the MMPI as the Edwards Social Desirability Scale did, and was free of pathological implications. If the individual answers in a socially desirable manner on all items, there will be eighteen true and fifteen false responses. The items on the MCSDS were rated on their social desirability by faculty and graduate students at Ohio State University had unanimous ratings on thirty-six items and 90% agreement on eleven items. Thirty-three items that discriminated between total high and low scores at the .05 alpha level were included in the finished measure. The correlation between the Edwards social desirability scale and the MCSDS was .35. Although several short forms of this measure have been devised, the full scale is still the more conservative choice (Loo & Thorpe, 2000).

Procedure

Participants signed up on posted sheets on the psychology department's bulletin board. Several data collection sessions was offered to participants. To qualify for this study, participants had to have been broken up with, within the last twelve months and the relationship had to be a serious, intimate relationship. Participants signed up knowing that they would be participating for a maximum of two hours and have a possibility of receiving four extra credits. They were informed that there was a chance that they would be asked to leave after the screening phase and only receive one extra credit. None of the participants were asked to leave. Participants signed-up and participated based on gender. Females signed up for female sessions with a female experimenter and males signed up for male sessions with a male experimenter. Same sex participants/ experimenter data collection rooms were maintained due to the sensitive nature of the questions and to avoid having ex-partners in the same testing session. The group size varied from one to sixteen participants per session. Prior to completing any of the questionnaires, participants were given a brief description of the study and the experimenter answered any questions posed (see Appendix K). The informed consent (see Appendix L) as well as a blank extra credit slip was distributed for the participants to read and sign. These materials had the participant's name on them and were collected by the experimenter prior to the distribution of any questionnaires to ensure anonymity. The students received an explanation of the anonymity of the study and were instructed not to put their name on anything. Participants were asked to answer all the questionnaires based on the recently terminated relationship.

The screener consisted of demographic information, motive questionnaire and the UPB scale. After all participants completed the screener they brought it up to the experimenter who looked at whether the person initiated the break-up or not and then distributed the appropriate

questionnaires. The experimental sessions took approximately one and one half-hours and participants received 1 credit point per half hour of participation in their respective psychology courses. The current study was concerned with the receiver of the break-up, the person who did not initiate the termination (a parallel study was run on the initiators). The questionnaires were administered in the following order:

- 1) Demographics Form
- 2) Motive Questionnaire, Reason for contact
- 3) Unwanted Pursuit Behavior Inventory, UPBI
- 4) Relationship Style Questionnaire, RSQ
- 5) Rape Myth Acceptance scale, RMAS
- 6) Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles-college revised, PICTS-CR
- 7) Symptom Checklist 90-Revised, SCL-90-R
- 8) Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Modified, ASBM
- 9) Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, M-C SDS

After completing the questionnaire packet, the participants walked to the front of the room to receive their extra credit slip and a copy of their informed consent form at which point the experimenter looked over the questionnaire for missing data. On the consent form (see Appendix L) they had the researcher's contact information and a list of local mental health services (see Appendix M). Any additional questions were answered by the experimenter. If the student had more questions or was interested in the outcome of the study s/he was encouraged to contact the experimenter at a later date. Participants were grouped into three groups, stalkers, harassers, and controls based on the criterion variable of UPB scores. Upon investigation of the responses on the UPB inventory, it was the author's belief that the total score and the severity

index, used by previous authors, did not accurately reflect the behavior of the participant. A person who admitted to physically threatening her ex-partner on three occasions could receive the same total score as someone who sent unwanted e-mails on more than five occasions. Participants were, therefore, assigned to one of the three aforementioned groups based on the following categorization. The stalking group included participants that endorsed any of the severe items on the UPB scale (items 16-26) more than once or at a higher frequency than one. The severe items for the original scale were set at item 14. However, this was changed to item 16 because these items incorporate a level of threat or fear. Items 16 and above include statements that clearly assume a threat of or actual harm to the victim such as “Have you ever threatened to harm your ex-partner with a weapon?”. This group assignment was further based on the legal requirement of stalking that it has to be a repeated pattern of behavior and incorporate a credible threat and victim fear. Victim fear was not assessed in the present study, endorsing more than one of the items incorporating a threat was therefore as close to the legal definition as a categorization could be, incorporating the other two components of the law (repeated pattern and credible threat). The harassing group included participants that had a total score on the UPB of 16 or above and endorsed only one or none of the severe items. The control group included participants who did not endorse any of the UPB items (this was included only one participant in the current sample) as well as participants who had a total score of 15 or below and that did not endorse any of the severe items.

Results

Among the female sample 23 (48%) was categorized into the Control group, 18 (37.5%) into the Harassing group and 7 (14.5%) into the Stalking group.

Demographics

The female sample consisted of 48 full-time students who had all been broken up with and there were no significant differences on the demographic variables between the groups as reported in three tables (See Tables 1, 2, & 3). In the sample, 73% were under age 20, 87.5% were Caucasian. Eighty-five point four percent lived with a roommate and 56.3% considered themselves as practicing a religion. Most of the participants, 41.7%, had had only one relationship, 31.3% reported having two relationships and 27.2% reported having three or more. Sixty point four percent of the sample did not work and 50% stated that they were involved in extracurricular activities. When asked about drinking and using drugs, 77.1% of the sample said they had used alcohol and 16.7% said they had used some drug.

Social desirability

Prior to the analyses, the between groups social desirability as measured by the Marlow-Crowne social desirability scale scores were investigated. The groups had the following means (with standard deviations in parentheses): Control = 16.65 (5.56), Harassing = 15.06 (6.16), and Stalking = 16.57 (4.39). These scores did not show any statistically significant group differences, $F(2, 45) = .438, p > .05$. Therefore, social desirability was not used as a covariate in the remaining analyses.

Psychological functioning

To investigate if the groups differed in their psychological function, the SCL-90 global severity index was used. The means (with standard deviations in parentheses) for the SCL-90 global severity index by group were Control = 1.85 (.51), Harassing = 2.11(.66), and Stalking = 2.09 (.74). The SCL-90 global severity index was also assessed using ANOVA analysis and did not reveal any significant group differences, $F(2, 45) = 1.09, p > .05$, so psychological functioning was not used as a covariate in the subsequent analyses.

Attachment

It was hypothesized that the stalking and harassing groups would have a larger percentage of insecure attachment than the control group. Table 4 presents the attachment style by group. Chi square analyses did not indicate any significant group differences, $\chi^2(2) = .431, p = .81$, for secure versus insecure attachment. There were 26.1% secure attachments in the Control, 22.2% secure attachments in the harassing group, and 14.3% of secure attachments in the stalking group, indicating a trend in the predicted direction.

Motivation

Gender differences were hypothesized to be present regarding the motive for the behavior but these were not assessed due to the limited male sample. The investigation of the motive data was therefore purely exploratory. Table 5 summarizes the self-reported initial and subsequent motive for contact after the break-up. Chi square analyses indicated that there were no statistically significant group differences regarding the initial motive for contact after the break-up, $\chi^2(12) = 8.35, p = .76$ (it should be noted that two people said that they had no contact after the break-up and both had been categorized in the harassing group). There were also no significant group differences of whether the participants changed the initial motive or not, $\chi^2(2) = .076, p = .96$. The participants that did indicate that they changed their motive were 27 total (Control $n = 12$, Harassing $n = 10$, Stalking $n = 4$). There were no statistically significant group differences present in the second motive reported, $\chi^2(14) = 16.39, p = .29$.

Cognitive factors

Stalkers and harassers were hypothesized to score higher on the RMA and ASBM questionnaires. The group means and standard deviations for the RMA and the ASBM questionnaires are presented in Table 6. ANOVA analyses were used to investigate potential

group differences on the RMA and the ASBM. Neither analysis revealed any significant differences, $F(2, 45) = .606, p > .05$, and $F(2, 45) = .754, p > .05$ respectively.

It was hypothesized that stalkers and harassers would score higher on three of the eight criminal thinking styles, the Mollification, Power orientation, and Entitlement. The PICTS data is presented in Table 7 and 8. ANOVA analyses were also used to investigate group differences on the PICTS. The analyses showed that there were group differences present on three of the eight thinking style scales. Mollification, $F(2, 45) = 4.79, p < .05$, Entitlement, $F(2, 45) = 3.87, p < .05$ and Power Orientation $F(2, 45) = 8.16, p < .05$. There were also group differences present on one of the two content scales, Historical Criminal Thinking (a person has previously identified with a criminal belief system), $F(2, 45) = 3.74, p < .05$ and on two of the four factor scales, Interpersonal Hostility (rarely endorsed this scale is indicative of a very hostile person who is bordering on confusion., $F(2, 45) = 3.31, p < .05$, and Self-Assertion (correlates to historical criminal thinking, entitlement and super optimism and imply a person who disregard the consequences in reaching their goal and have no problems forcing their will on another person., $F(2, 45) = 3.26, p < .05$. The special scale, Fear of Change, showed no group differences.

When investigating the group means across the PICTS (See Table 7 & 8) it is revealed that the Harassing and Stalking groups are very similar. The Harassing and Stalking groups were not statistically different on the Mollification, Power Orientation, or Historical Criminal Thinking. The LSD post hoc test showed that there was a significant difference between the Control group and the other two groups (Harassing and Stalking) on all of the significant variables mentioned above but not for Entitlement, Interpersonal Hostility, and Self Assertion. For the Entitlement scale, the Harassing group is significantly different from the Control group

but the Stalking group shows a trend to be different from the Control group. On the Interpersonal hostility factor scale, the control and the harassing groups are significantly different but the stalking group is not significantly different from either. Based on the LSD post hoc test for the Self Assertion factor scale, the harassing group is not significantly different from neither the control nor the stalking groups. The stalking and control groups are significantly different and there is also a trend present indicating that the harassing group could have been different from the control group with a larger sample size.

Discussion

This study surveyed 223 undergraduate students who had experienced a break-up within the last year of an intimate relationship that lasted for more than a month. The study was aimed at investigating a subsample of this population; the persons who did not initiate the break-up because it was assumed that a disgruntled partner is the person who will engage in unwanted pursuit behavior that can become stalking. Due to the small number of male participants, that sample was excluded from the data analyses and will therefore not be discussed in the subsequent section. The rates of violence by female stalkers have been found to be at similar levels to male stalkers (Purcell, Pathé, & Mullen, 2001; Rosenfeld & Harmon, 2002) and female stalking behavior would therefore be equally important to examine. The sample was divided into the three groups; controls, harassers, and stalkers based on their answers on the UPB inventory. The categorization used to place participants into the stalking group is an improvement on how to utilize the UPB inventory and more accurately reflect the legal requirements of a stalker.

Demographic variables

The demographic variables collected for the sample did not show any statistically significant group differences. This finding replicates another study by Haugaard and Seri (2004)

which also failed to find differences between stalkers and non-stalkers on a multitude of demographical variables. The current study as well as the Haugaard and Seri's study used undergraduate samples which may not be diverse enough to see any possible demographic differences.

Attachment

Previous studies have indicated that there are significantly higher number of college students that engage in stalking who have an insecure attachment than non-stalkers (Fremouw et al., 2001) and that people who were high on nurturance and support seeking perpetrated more unwanted pursuit behavior (Langhinrichsen-Roling et al., 2000). The present study hypothesized that persons classified in the stalking group would have significantly higher mean scores on the insecure attachments as well as account for the higher percentage of the insecure attachments. This hypothesis was not supported. There was not a statistically significant difference between the groups' attachment styles. The stalking group does have the highest relative percentage of persons with an insecure attachment but possibly due to the small sample size or lack of power, this is not a significant finding. Thus, for this sample of females engaging in unwanted pursuit behaviors the previous findings did not replicate.

Motivation

In the NVAW survey (Tjaden & Thonnes, 1998) the motivation behind a persons pursuit of an unwilling other was first examined. The victims identified three motives that they thought was the reason their perpetrator pursued them: control (21%), reconciliation (20%), and intimidation (16%). Purcell, Pathé, and Mullen (2001) used predetermined categories (Mullen, Pathé, Purcell, & Stuart, 1999) to investigate the motive of 40 female stalkers using the subjects' records and reported that 45 % were deemed intimacy seekers, 25% rejected, 18% resentful and

10 % incompetent. To further explore the self-reported motive of female stalkers as compared to harassers and control subjects' motives for their contact with an ex-partner, was a natural extension of the previous literature. (Note that in the current study there were three participants that did not indicate a motive for their contact, one in the control and two in the harassing group).

There were no significant group differences in the initial motivation, whether the motive changed, or the subsequent motive (if a change was indicated). This may reflect a poor insight into the motives of their own behavior in the harassing and stalking groups. Sinclair and Frieze (2002) reported that self-identified stalkers had poor insight into the negative effects of their behavior on their victim. It might be that persons engaging in this type of behavior are poor reporters of both motivation and consequence of their actions. Another possibility is that these participants may be inclined to report a more socially acceptable reason for their unwanted contact such as staying friends versus revenge. In the present study, the social desirability measure administered did not show significant group differences, so just social desirability is not likely.

Lastly, it may be that this unacceptable behavior (harassing & stalking) is actually motivated by the same reasons as the more acceptable methods of contact that normally occurs after a break-up. The persons in the stalking and harassing groups, however, may use very different means to achieve their goal. Furthermore, the stalking group all used alcohol and may be more likely than the control group to be disinhibited by alcohol. There was a trend in the current sample with 65.2% in the control group, 83.3% in the harassing group, and 100% in the stalking group using alcohol. This trend was, however, not statistically significant because of the small sample size.

Due to the limited sample size, gender differences were not examined. Purcell, Pathé, and Mullen (2001) using a record review failed to classify any of their female participants into the predatory category of stalking and it should be noted that not one of the female participants in the present study endorsed “to check that no one else was there” or “because I wanted to scare him” as a motive for their behavior. This is the first study assessing self-reported motives and future studies should incorporate self-reported motives, rather than classification by a third party into predetermined categories, in male stalking populations.

Cognitive factors

The hypothesis that persons in the stalking group would endorse more rape myths, as measured by the RMA, and more adversarial sexual beliefs, as measured by the ASBM, was not supported. The present study found no group differences on the RMA in the population of females. The range of the RMA is from 19 to 96, and a mean score of 53.4 for male factory workers suggests a high adherence to a number of rape myths (Burt, 1980). The female sample in the present study did not show high mean scores relative to the male factory worker norms. The means (with standard deviations in parentheses) for the groups were as follows: control = 37.35 (9.35), Harassing = 41.06 (11.14), and Stalking = 38.71 (13.76). The level of rape myth acceptance is however higher than for a sample of 282 female athletes from five institutions that had a mean score of 33.82 (SD = 8.15) (Sawyer, 2002). In the aforementioned study the 421 male athletes had a mean score of 41.83 (SD = 10.78) and almost 50% of these males reported that they believed that 50% of women reporting rapes are making them up. Considering that the female sample in the present study has similar scores to the males in the Sawyer study the campus groups against rape may want to attempt to reduce these rape myth attitudes, through education. The finding of Sinclair and Frieze (2002) that the ASBM positively correlated with

females' intimidation behavior did not replicate in the current study, where no significant group differences were found.

The current study used a slightly adapted version of the PICTS questionnaire (Walter, 2001) to measure criminal thinking styles in a college population. It was hypothesized that persons engaging in unwanted pursuit behaviors would score higher on the three thinking styles of Mollification, Power Orientation, and Entitlement. The data analyses supported the hypotheses concerning the Mollification (justifying actions by externalizing blame) and Power Orientation (a person who attempts to control the external environment by sacrificing internal control) thinking styles. There is a significant difference between both the harassing and the stalking groups as compared to the control group. This finding suggests that people who engage in harassing and stalking behavior are more likely than controls, to justify their behavior by externalizing blame. Furthermore, that these people want to exert control and power over others. This may further suggest that the victim is a more objective reporter of the motive of the unwanted pursuit behavior than the perpetrator. The NVAW survey of victims identified control as the primary motive for the behavior (Tjaden & Thonnes, 1998). This finding is an important contribution to the classification of stalkers providing more insight into the distorted thinking of a person engaging in unwanted pursuit behavior. Lastly cognitive distortions may be especially important in treatment of a harasser/stalker in that the person conducting the treatment can narrow the focus of treatment on personal control and impulse training as well as working with the person to take responsibility for one's actions.

The hypotheses about the Entitlement thinking style was partially supported. High scores on the entitlement thinking scale suggests a person who may mislabel wants as needs and grant her/him-self permission to disregard the law. The harassing group is significantly different from

the control group but the stalking group is only showing a trend towards being different than the control group. The stalking and harassing groups were not, however, significantly different. If a larger sample of stalkers could be recruited this trend may become significant. This finding suggests that persons who engage in harassing are more likely to view themselves as special, and give themselves permission to harass a person due to their own sense of ownership. The results further indicated that persons categorized as harassing others are more likely to think they are entitled to do so; their distorted thinking gives them the privilege to engage in this type of behavior. A possible explanation for why this thinking style may be more enduring, with persons harassing others, is that this lesser form of stalking may be a behavior a disgruntled lover can better minimize and feel entitled to than the more extreme behavior of stalking.

There were no hypotheses made regarding the content, factor or special scales on the PICTS but the data from some of these scales did reveal significant group differences. The Historical Criminal Thinking content scale results indicated that the harassers and stalkers were significantly more likely to have previously identified with a criminal belief system than the controls. This may simply suggest that these people (harassers & stalkers) have had more illegal experiences (such as underage drinking, vandalism, etc.) than the people in the control group. The fact that there are no such group differences on the Current Criminal Thinking scale may indicate that the persons engaging in the unwanted pursuit behavior are not able to recognize their behavior as problematic while in the situation.

The results also indicate that there is a significant group difference present on the Interpersonal Hostility factor scale, with the harassing group endorsing more hostile confusion items than both the stalking and the control group. The Interpersonal Hostility factor scale is not,

however, a robust scale and it is rarely endorsed (Walters, 2001). Until this scale is further evaluated no conclusions will be made about this finding.

The Self-Assertion factor scale show a significant group difference between the control and stalking group. There is also a trend for the harassing group to be different from the control but this difference is not significant. This result suggests that the persons engaging in stalking behavior have a greater tendency, than controls, to force there will on another regardless of the consequences of their behavior. This is compatible with the methods with which a stalker tries to pursue their victim. A stalker often engages in actions in which s/he will get noticed, showing up, mailing presents, making threats or physically damaging people and property. The aforementioned actions, when knowingly unwanted, would in themselves indicate a person who is impulsive and/or not concerned with possible consequences of his/her behavior.

Conclusion of significant results

In a meta-analysis, of 10 stalking studies, Rosenfeld (2004) came to the conclusion that the most consistent predictors of violence in a stalking situation were threats, substance abuse, a previously intimate relationship between the parties, and no psychosis in the perpetrator. These findings support the use of the current sample to further investigate the potentially violent persons categorized into the stalking group. The present study showed, however, that there may be a part, rarely investigated in the stalking literature, that factor into the equation of predicting violent stalking behavior, cognitions. Cognitions, as the antecedent of behavioral action, are an important factor to investigate, and should not be forgotten, as the research community attempts to classify, understand, prevent, and treat stalking behavior.

The current study showed that in a sample of students, the females engaging in harassing and stalking behavior were more likely to have cognitive distortions indicating a desire to control

others, a justification to do so by blaming external rather than internal factors, and a disregard for the potential consequences of their actions. This may be something many intuitively expected but these cognitive distortions may have some very real consequences, if overlooked, for the treatment of a person exhibiting harassing and stalking behavior.

There are multiple ways to treat a problem. In the case of stalking, one can use the predictors of stalking violence named by Rosenfeld (2004) and focus treatment on substance abuse prevention and punish behavior such as threats and violence. There are multiple punishments in place for the individual who engages in this type of problematic behavior, such as restraining orders, fines, probation, and incarceration. However, these punishments may not be successful in preventing this behavior in a person who thinks s/he needs to control another, that his/her actions are not their fault but society's, their ex-partner's or their parents', and who gives little or no thought to potential consequences.

In attempting to decrease the prevalence of a problem as complicated as stalking, I would suggest to use all the information collected through research and implement individualized treatment with regards to all factors involved in behavior, antecedents, behavior, and consequences. The PICTS measure could be used to better classify the cognitive distortions of an individual stalker and be used to better focus the treatment to the individual's distortions (such as impulse control or responsibility training) in conjunction with substance abuse education, and the societal punishments.

Limitations

There are multiple limitations present in the current study. Due to the lack of male participants, potential gender differences could not be investigated for any of the variables discussed. Furthermore, the sample size of the female participants is not large. A larger and more

diverse (age, race, education, gender, socioeconomic status and region) sample would improve the contribution to the stalking literature. Using a self-report measure brings its own limitations in that it is a subjective measure of a person's experience. Ratings by others of a person's attachment style for example, could have broadened the assessment of attachment. This study utilized a relatively new questionnaire the UPB inventory (Langhinrichsen-Roling et al., 2000) to assess the stalking behavior and this may have influenced the ability to replicate the attachment finding from the Lewis et al. study (2001) which utilized the Stalking Behavior Checklist (Coleman, 1997). When examining the questionnaire items one can assume high intercorrelation between the two measures. The sample was also limited in that it did not include a criminal sample of stalkers that could be used for comparisons such as Zona (1993), Meloy and Gothard (1995), Zona, Palarea and Lane (1998), Purcell, Pathé, and Mullen (2001).

Future directions

There is a need for more research into the substance use of persons engaging in unwanted pursuit behavior. The current study showed a trend towards drinking being more prevalent in the harassing and stalking groups versus the control. Rosenfeld's meta-analysis did indicate that substance abuse was a strong factor for increased risk for violence, but there were no gender differences discussed. It was unclear if the meta-analysis studies included any females at all. Future research should investigate substance abuse because it may be a very important component in lowering a person's inhibitions and increasing the possibility of violent behavior in both genders of stalking perpetrators.

The finding that stalking behavior may be motivated by the same reasons as normal contact between the parties of a break-up also needs further exploration. It would also be

important to compare the self-reported motives of female and male stalkers. An attempt should also be made to replicate the current finding in a more demographically diverse sample.

The cognitive distortions, measured by the PICTS, of different persons engaging in stalking behavior need further investigation. The original PICTS could be used with the criminally convicted stalking population, and the adapted PICTS used in the current study, would be better suited for the not yet convicted stalking populations. Further replication of these findings in a more diverse (age, education, race, gender, etc.) and larger sample would greatly improve the knowledge base of cognitive distortions of persons engaging in harassing and stalking behavior. Lastly the cognitive distortions of male stalkers needs to be examined and compared to those found in female stalkers.

References

- Abel, G. G., Becker, J. V., & Cunningham-Rathner, J. (1984). Complications, consent, and cognitions in sex between children and adults. *International Journal of Psychiatry*, 7, 89-103.
- Ainsworth, M., Blehar, M., Walters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (4th ed. text revision). Washington, DC: Author.
- Asberg, M., Kragh-sorensen, P., Mindham, R.S., & Tuck, J.R. (1973). Reliability and communicability of a rating scale for depression. *Psychological Medicine*, 3, 458-465.
- Bartholomew, K. (1990). Avoidance of intimacy: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 7, 147-178.
- Bartholomew, K. (1994). The assessment of individual differences in adult attachment. *Psychological Inquiry*, 5, 23-27.
- Bartholomew, K. (1997). Adult attachment processes: individual and couple perspectives. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 70, 249-263.
- Bowlby, J. (1951). *Maternal care and mental health*. Geneva: W.H.O.
- Bowlby, J. (1971). *Attachment and Loss. Vol. I!: Attachment*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self report measure of adult attachment: An integrative overview. In J. Simpson & W. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 46-76). New York: Guilford.
- Briere, J. & Malamuth, N. M. (1983). Self-reported likelihood of sexually aggressive behavior: attitudinal versus sexual explanations. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 17, 315-323.

- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 217-230.
- Coleman, F. L. (1997). Stalking behavior and the cycle of domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12, 420-432.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlow, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24, 349-354.
- Cupach, W., R., & Spitzberg, B., H. (1998). Obsessional relational intrusions and stalking. In B.H. Spitzberg & W.R. Cupach (Eds.), *The dark side of close relationships* (pp.233-263). Mahwah, NJ:Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Davis, K. E., Ace, A., & Andra, M. (2000). Stalking perpetrators and psychological maltreatment of partners: Anger-jealousy, attachment insecurity, need for control, and break-up context. *Violence and Victims*, 15, 407-425.
- Davis, K. E., & Hanson Frieze, I. (2000). Research on stalking: what do we know and where do we go? *Violence and Victims*, 15, 473-487.
- Derogatis, L. R. (1994). *Symptom Checklist-90-R: Administration, Scoring, and Procedures Manual* (3rd ed.). Minneapolis, MN: National Computer System.
- Derogatis, L. R. (1977). *SCL-90-R: Administration, Scoring, and Procedures Manual I*. Baltimore, MD: Clinical Psychometric Research.
- Dutton, D. (1999). Traumatic origins of intimate rage. *Aggression and violent behavior*, 4, 431-447.
- Foa E. (1995). *Posttraumatic Stress Diagnostic Scale*. Minneapolis, MN: National Computer Systems, Inc.
- Fonagy, P. (1999). Male perpetrators of violence against women: an attachment theory

- perspective. *Journal of applied psychoanalytic studies*, 1, 7-27.
- Fremouw, W. J., Westrup, D., & Pennypacker, J. (1997). Stalking on campus: The prevalence and strategies for coping with stalking. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 42, 666-669.
- Griffin, D. W., & Bartholomew, K. (1994). The metaphysics of measurement: The case of adult attachment. In Bartholomew, K., & Perlman, D. (Eds.). *Advances in Personal Relationships Vol. 5: Attachment Processes in Adulthood*, (pp.17-51). Durham, N.H: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Hamilton, M., & Yee, J. (1990). Rape knowledge and propensity to rape. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 24, 111-122.
- Hanley, J. M., & O'Neill, P. (1997). Violence and commitment a study of dating couples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12, 685-703.
- Hare, R. D. (1991). *The Psychopathy Checklist*. Toronto, Ontario: Multi-Health Systems.
- Hatch-Mailette, M.A., Scalora, M. J., Huss, M.T., & Baumgartner, J.V. (2001). Criminal thinking patterns: Are child molesters unique? *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 45(1), 102-117.
- Haugaard, J. J., & Seri, L. G. (2004). Stalking and other forms of intrusive contact among adolescents and young adults from the perspective of the person initiating the intrusive contact. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 31(1), 37-54.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Stuart, G., & Hutchinson, G. (1997). Violent versus nonviolent husbands: Differences in attachment patterns, dependency, and jealousy. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 11, 314-331.
- Howell, D. C. (2002). *Statistical methods for psychology* (5th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Duxbury, Thomson learning.

- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., & Rohling, M. (2002). Negative family-of-origin experiences: Are they associated with perpetrating unwanted pursuit behaviors? ?. In K.E. Davis, I. Hanson Frieze, & R. D. Maiuro (Eds.), *Stalking perspectives on victims and perpetrators*, (pp. 312-329). New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Palarea, R.. E., Cohen, J., & Rohling, M. (2000). Breaking up is hard to do: Unwanted pursuit behaviors following the dissolution of a romantic relationship. *Violence and Victims*, 15, 73-90.
- Lewis, S. F., Fremouw, W. J., Del Ben, K., & Farr, C. (2001). An investigation of the psychological characteristics of stalkers: empathy, problem-solving, attachment and borderline personality features. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 46, 077-081.
- Loo R., & Thorpe K. (2000). Confirmatory factor analyses of the full Marlow-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 140, 628-635.
- Main, M., & Solomon, J. (1986). Discovery of an insecure-disorganized/disoriented attachment pattern. In T. B. Brazelton & M. W. Yogman (Eds.), *Affective development in infancy* (pp. 95-124). Norwood, NJ:Ablex.
- Main, M., & Solomon, J. (1990). Procedures for identifying infantsas disorganized/disoriented during the Ainsworth Strange Situatuion. In M. Greenberg, D. Cicchetti & E. Cummings (Eds.), *Attachment in the preschool years* (pp. 121-160). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Malamuth, N.M. (1981). Rape proclivity among males. *Journal of Social Issues*, 37, 138-157.
- MacDonald, A. P., Kessel, V. S., & Fuller, J. B. (1972). Self-disclosure and two kinds of trust. *Psychological Rep*, 30, 143-148.
- Meloy, J. R. (1996). Stalking (obsessional following): A review of some preliminary studies.

- Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 1, 147-162.
- Meloy, J. R., & Gothard, S. (1995). Demographic and clinical comparison of obsessional followers and offenders with mental disorders. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 152, 258-263.
- Meloy, J. R. (2003). Pathologies of attachment, violence, and criminality. In Goldestein, A. M., & Weiner, I. B. (Eds.), *Handbook of Psychology* (pp.509-526). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Meloy, J. R. (2000). *Violence, risk and threat assessment*. San Diego, CA: Specialized Training Services.
- Michie's West Virginia code annotated* vol. 17, supplement (2004). Charlottesville, VA: Lexisnexis.
- Mullen, P. E., Pathé, M., & Purcell, R. (2000). *Stalkers and their victims*. (Eds.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mullen, P. E., Pathé, M., Purcell, R., & Stuart, G. W. (1999). Study of stalkers. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 156, 1244-1249.
- Pathé, M., & Mullen, P. E. (1997). The impact of stalkers on their victims. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 170, 12-17.
- Peveler, R. C., & Fairburn, C.G. (1990). Measurement of neurotic symptoms by self-report questionnaire: Validity of the SCL-90-R. *Psychological Medicine*, 20(4), 873-870.
- Purcell, R., Pathé, M., & Mullen, P. E. (2001). A study of women who stalk. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 158, 2056-2060.
- Rathus, J., & O'Leary, K. D. (1997). Spouse-specific dependency scale: Scale development. *Journal of Family Violence*, 12, 159-168.

- Rosenfeld, B., & Harmon, R. (2002). Factors associated with violence in stalking and obsessional harassment cases. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 29, 671-691.
- Rosenfeld, B. (2004). Violence risk factors in stalking and obsessional harassment; A review and preliminary meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 31(1), 9-36.
- Sawyer, R., G., Thompson, E., E., & Chicorelli, A. M. (2002). Rape myth acceptance among intercollegiate student athletes: a preliminary examination. *American Journal of Health Studies*, winter. Retrieved September 22, 2004 from www.findarticles.com
- Sinclair, C. H., & Hanson Frieze, I. (2002). Initial courtship behavior and stalking: how should we draw the line?. In K.E. Davis, I. Hanson Frieze, & R. D. Maiuro (Eds.), *Stalking perspectives on victims and perpetrators*, (pp. 186-111). New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company
- Spitzberg, B., H. (2002). The tactical topography of stalking victimization and management. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 3, 261-288.
- Tjaden, P. (1997). *The crime of stalking: How big is the problem?* Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1998). Stalking in America: findings from the national violence against women survey. Denver, CO: Center for Policy Research.
- Tweed, R., & Dutton, D. (1998). A comparison of impulsive and instrumental subgroups of batterers. *Violence and Victims*, 13, 217-230.
- Walters, G. D., White, T. W., & Denney, D. (1991). The Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form: Preliminary data. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 18, 406-418.
- Walters, G. D. (1995). The Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles: Part I. reliability and preliminary validity. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 22, 307-325.

- Walters, G. D. (1996). The Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles: Part III. Predictive validity. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 40, 105-112.
- Walters, G. D. (1998). The Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form: Psychometric properties and practical utility. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 27, 9-23.
- Walters, G. D. (2001) *Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles* (version 4.0). Manual obtained from author via e-mail.
- Waltz, J., Babcock, J., Jacobson, N., & Gottman, J. (2000). Testing a typology of batterers. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 68, 658-669.
- Westrup, D., & Fremouw, W., J. (1998). Stalking behavior: a literature review and suggested functional analytic assessment technology. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 3, 255-74.
- Westrup, D., Fremouw, W., J., Thompson, R., N., & Lewis, S., F. (1999). The psychological impact of stalking on female undergraduates. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 44, 554-557.
- Wright, J. A., Burgess, A. G., Laszlo, A. T., McCrary, G. O., & Douglas, J. E. (1996). A typology of interpersonal stalking. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 11(4), 487-502.
- Zona, M. A., Sharma, K., K., & Lane, J. (1993). A comparative study of erotomaniac and obsessional subjects in a forensic sample. *Journal of Forensic sciences*, 4, 894-903.
- Zona, M. A., Palarea, R.E., & Lane, J. (1998). Psychiatric diagnosis and the offender-victim typology of stalking. In J. Reid Meloy (Ed.) *The Psychology of Stalking: Clinical and Forensic Perspectives* (pp. 70-84). San Diego: Academic Press.

Appendix A

**STUDENTS WHO HAVE RECENTLY BEEN THROUGH A BREAK-UP OF A
SERIOUS AND INTIMATE RELATIONSHIP!!!**

If you are currently enrolled in a psychology class where you can earn extra credit points this might be an opportunity for you?!

Have you been through a break up within the last 12 months?

Was it a serious relationship (duration more than a month)?

Was it an intimate relationship? (some sexual contact)?

If you have answered **YES** to all these questions you can participate in this study!!

This study is an **anonymous** questionnaire study where you can earn 1 credit for the screener and, if you qualify for the full study, you can earn at least 3 more credits. The questionnaires will ask a multitude of questions regarding relationships, opinions and mental health. If this sounds like something you would be interested in, please sign up with your name and e-mail address below on the empty lines for the session of your choice.

EXAMPLE OF SIGN UP SHEET

Monday Females

3:00 p.m.	1 _____
	2 _____
	3 _____
	4 _____
	5 _____
	6 _____
	7 _____

Appendix B

Demographic Form

For the following the questions, please circle or fill in the best possible choice(s) that describes your current lifestyle.

Did you initiate the break-up?

- 1) Yes
- 2) No

Gender:

- 1) Male
- 2) Female

Age: _____

Race:

- 1) Caucasian
- 2) Latin-American
- 3) African-American
- 4) Asian-American
- 5) Native-American
- 6) Arabic-American
- 7) Other: _____ (please specify)

Are you a native speaker of “English”?

- 1) Yes
- 2) No

If you answered “no” what is your native language: _____ (please specify)

Religious beliefs: _____ (please specify)

Do you consider yourself a religious /practicing person?

- 1) Yes
- 2) No

Current relationship status:

- 1) Single
- 2) Married
- 3) Divorced
- 4) Widowed

How many serious intimate relationships have you had? _____

My partners have been:

- 1) Opposite sex
- 2) Same sex
- 3) Both

The relationship that ended and made me eligible for this study was:

- 1) Opposite sex
- 2) Same sex
- 3) Both

Current living situation:

- 1) At home with parents
- 2) With significant other
- 3) With roommate(s)

Current location:

- 1) Alone
- 2) Dorm
- 3) House
- 4) Apartment
- 5) Trailer
- 6) Other _____ (Please specify)

Current work status:

- 1) Full-time student
- 2) Part-time student
- 3) Full-time work
- 4) Part-time work
- 5) Full-time student w/work (full or part-time)
- 6) Part-time student w/work (full or part-time)

Are you involved in any clubs, activities, or athletics?: Yes

No

If you answered “yes” please list what you are currently involved in: _____

Class standing:

- 1) Freshman

- 2) Sophomore
- 3) Junior
- 4) Senior
- 5) Other: _____ (Please specify)

Current overall GPA:

- 1) 4.00-3.50
- 2) 3.49-3.00
- 3) 2.99-2.50
- 4) 2.49-2.00
- 5) 2.00>

Do you drink alcoholic beverages?

- 1) Yes
- 2) No

If you answered "yes" please specify:

- 1) Every day
- 2) Several times a week
- 3) Once a week
- 4) Every other week
- 5) Less than once a month

Do you use illicit drugs?

- 1) Yes
- 2) No

If you answered "yes" please specify:

- 1) Every day
- 2) Several times a week
- 3) Once a week
- 4) Every other week
- 5) Less than once a month

Have you ever been charged with a felony?

- 1) Yes
- 2) No

If you answered "yes" what was the charge? _____

Have you ever been convicted of a felony?

- 1) Yes
- 2) No

If you answered "yes" what was the sentence? _____

Have you ever been in jail?

- 1) Yes
- 2) No

If you answered “yes” how long (total time) have you spent being incarcerated? _____

Have you ever served any prison time?

- 1) Yes
- 2) No

If you answered “yes” how long of a sentence? _____

Appendix C

UPBI

Directions: Think of the relationship that just ended and please answer the questions regarding this last ex-partner of yours.

0= *Never*

1= *Only once*

2= *2 to 3 times*

3= *4 to 5 times*

4= *Over 5 times*

1) Have you ever left unwanted phone messages?	0 1 2 3 4
2) Have you ever sent or left unwanted letters or gifts?	0 1 2 3 4
3) Have you ever made unwanted phone calls?	0 1 2 3 4
4) Have you ever sent an unwanted e-mail or electronic chat (e.g. instant messaging)?	0 1 2 3 4
5) Have you ever had an in-person conversation with that individual following the breakup?	0 1 2 3 4
6) Have you ever given an individual gift(s) in person following the breakup?	0 1 2 3 4
7) Have you ever asked the friends of your ex-partner about him/her?	0 1 2 3 4
8) Have you ever contacted your ex-partners family regarding the status of him/her?	0 1 2 3 4
9) Have you ever shown up at places your ex-partner has been ?	0 1 2 3 4

10) Have you ever made the effort of having your ex-partner run into you?	0 1 2 3 4
11) Have you ever made visits to your ex-partners home?	0 1 2 3 4
12) Have you ever visited your ex-partner at their school/work?	0 1 2 3 4
13) Have you ever waited outside of school for your ex-partner?	0 1 2 3 4
14) Have you ever followed your ex-partner around?	0 1 2 3 4
15) Have you ever made vague threats towards your ex-partner?	0 1 2 3 4
16) Have you ever threatened to release information regarding your ex-partner?	0 1 2 3 4
17) Have you ever threatened to harm your ex-partner?	0 1 2 3 4
18) Have you ever made threats towards your ex-partners pets/family?	0 1 2 3 4
19) Have you ever threatened to harm your ex-partner with a weapon?	0 1 2 3 4
20) Have you ever released harmful information about your ex-partner?	0 1 2 3 4
21) Have you ever stolen items from your ex-partner?	0 1 2 3 4

22) Have you ever damaged property of your ex-partner?	0 1 2 3 4
23) Have you ever harmed a family member/pet of your ex-partner?	0 1 2 3 4
24) Have you ever injured your ex-partner?	0 1 2 3 4
25) Have you ever kidnapped or held your ex-partner against their will?	0 1 2 3 4
26) Have you ever had forced sex with your ex-partner after breaking up?	0 1 2 3 4

Appendix D

Reason for contact

Did you ever try to contact your ex-partner after the break-up?   Yes   No

*If yes, why did you contact your ex-partner ? Please rank applicable reasons from 1 (most important to 10 (least important)

- _____ In an attempt to win him/her back
- _____ In an attempt to stay friends
- _____ To get an explanation
- _____ To finish exchanging items
- _____ To settle some issues
- _____ For revenge
- _____ To check that there wasn't anyone else there
- _____ Because I was lonely
- _____ Because I wanted to scare him/her
- _____ If you think that you had another motivation please state it _____

Did your motivation for trying to contact your ex-partner ever change?   Yes   No

* How long after the break up did your motivation change? (approximate)

_____

* What did it change to? Please number as many reasons as you had in order from most = 1 to least = 10 important.

- _____ In an attempt to win him/her back
- _____ In an attempt to stay friends
- _____ To get an explanation
- _____ To finish exchanging items
- _____ To settle some issues
- _____ For revenge
- _____ To check that there wasn't anyone else there
- _____ Because I was lonely
- _____ Because I wanted to scare him/her
- _____ If you think that you had another motivation please state it _____

Appendix E

Hi and welcome to this study!

I am _____.

First you will get an informed consent form to read over, and if you have any questions just raise your hand. When you have finished reading the consent form you will sign it if you want to participate in this study and turn it in to me. You will also have a credit slip on your desk go ahead and fill in your name if you signed the consent form. After that is done I will give you a screening questionnaire consisting of three different section. Remember this is an **Anonymous** study so don't put your name on anything, O.K?!

After the screening you will either receive one extra credit point and be asked to leave or continue with the full study. This is in no way reflective of you, just on how many participants we have in different groups already. If you continue with the full study you will answer more questionnaires concerning relationships, attitudes, health and opinions. There are some sensitive questions on here about sex, alcohol and attitudes. If you feel uncomfortable and want to view the questions now, let me now?! It is very important that you answer the questions truthfully. Please remember NOT to put your name on anything so we can ensure anonymity. Remember that you can withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and receive 1 credit per half-hour of time spent up to three extra credits. There are also other options offered by your teacher to get extra credit.

Any questions?

Appendix F

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY: INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Study Title: Issues surrounding a relationship break up in a college population

Investigators: Jill Johansson-Love B.S., principal investigator and William Fremouw Ph.D., co investigator.

Introduction. I, _____, have been invited to participate in this study that has been explained to me by the present examiner _____. I have been informed that this research is being conducted as a masters thesis research project for Jill Johansson-Love B.S. under the direct supervision of William Fremouw Ph.D. in the Department of Psychology at West Virginia University.

Performance Sites: West Virginia University

Purpose of Study: To collect information concerning the antecedents (prior events) and the consequences (events after) of the termination of an intimate relationship.

Description of study: I will answer anonymous questionnaires, if I meet the study requirement for participation. I understand that some of the questionnaires will ask me some potentially sensitive questions regarding this prior relationship, but that all material I answer are anonymous and that I should not put my name on any of the actual testing materials. This procedure will take approximately one and one half-hour to complete. I understand that I am not required to answer these questions or to participate in this study. I may view the questions before signing this consent form. Approximately 600 participants will be involved in this study

Subject Inclusion: All subjects will be eighteen years of age and enrolled in a psychology course at West Virginia University. Approximately 600 subjects will be participating in this study. All participants will have been in an intimate relationship within the last 12 months which is now ended.

Subject Exclusion: This study excludes anyone under 18 years of age and anyone who has not had an intimate relationship that ended within the last six months.

Risks: There are no known or expected emotional or physical risks associated with participation in the study, aside from the time associated with completing the questionnaires and mild discomfort that might arise in response to being asked about psychological symptoms and personal experiences. I understand that all participants will be given a list of local mental health resources.

Initial here _____

Alternatives: I may choose not to participate in this study or choose not to answer any of the questionnaires or questions. I understand that participation is voluntary. Class standing or grades, will not be affected by my refusal to participate, or withdrawal from this study. If I withdraw from the study I will receive one extra credit point per half-hour of time spent in the study regardless of when I withdraw. I understand that there are other methods of obtaining extra credit in my psychology course. I understand that these opportunities are listed on the Subject Recruitment Board near the main office in the Life Sciences Building and that my instructor can offer even more opportunities.

Benefits: I will receive extra credit for my participation, one extra credit per half-hour of time spent participating in the study. The information I provide will not be of direct benefit to me, but the knowledge gain through this study may be of benefit to others.

Right to Refuse: Participation in this study is voluntary, and I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time without penalty of any kind. I will receive 1 credit per half-hour of time spent in the study.

Confidentiality: All data will be anonymous. I understand that I should only sign the informed consent form to participate in the study and that it will be separate from any other information that I will provide. I understand that I should not put my name on any of the questionnaires. I understand that the research records just like hospital records and may be subpoenaed by court order or may be inspected by federal regulatory authorities. I understand that none of the information that I will share on the questionnaires will be connected to my name in anyway. The data will be kept in a locked lab in the Life Science Building until five years after publication, at which time it will be shredded.

Questions: If I have any questions about the research, I will contact Jill Johansson-Love, B.S., West Virginia University, e-mail: jjohanss@mix.wvu.edu.

The study has been discussed with me and all my questions have been answered. I understand that additional questions regarding the study should be directed to the investigator listed above Jill Johansson-Love and William Freemouw. I understand that if I have questions about subject rights, or other concerns, I can contact the Executive Secretary of the Institutional Review Board at 292-7073. I agree with the terms above and acknowledge that I have been given a copy of the consent form.

Initial here _____

I willingly consent to participate in this research.

_____
Participant's name (Print)

_____
Date

_____
Time

_____
Participant's signature

_____
Signature of Examiner

_____
Date

_____
Time

Initial here _____

Appendix G

LOCAL MENTAL HEALTH RESOURCES

Because completion of surveys, such as the ones you just did, may make some persons realize that they are experiencing an uncomfortable level of worry or depression, the investigators in this study are providing all participating students this information form, which lists several local mental health and counseling services that are available to them if they feel that they would like to talk with someone about their feelings.

Additionally, participants may contact Jill Johansson-Love, B.S. or William Fremouw, PhD. at 293-2001x 31662.

This is a partial list of services in this area (Morgantown, WV) in case you feel that you need assistance. Inclusion on this list does not imply endorsement of the agency by the investigators in this study, nor does it in any way imply that the investigators are financially responsible for any services requested or received as a result of participation in this study.

Carruth Center for Counseling and Psychological Services*
Student Services Center
West Virginia University
Morgantown, WV 26506
(304) 293-4431

Chestnut Ridge Hospital
930 Chestnut Ridge Road
Morgantown, WV 26505
(304) 293-4000

The Quin Curtis Center
Life Sciences Building, Department of Psychology
West Virginia University
Morgantown, WV 26506
(304) 293-2001, ext 31671

Valley Comprehensive Community Mental Health Center
301 Scott Avenue
Morgantown, WV 26505
(304) 296-1731

The Vet Center (military veterans only)
Greenbag Road
Morgantown, WV 26505
(304) 291-4303

*Students who have paid WVU tuition and fees may receive services free of charge at this agency.

Table 1.

Time since break-up, age and race by group

Measure	<u>Control</u>		<u>Harassing</u>		<u>Stalking</u>		χ^2
	%	n	%	n	%	n	
<u>Time since break-up</u>							1.11 *
< 6 weeks	21.7	5	16.7	3	14.3	1	
>6 weeks	56.5	13	50	9	71.4	5	
<u>Age</u>							2.14 *
18 years	47.8	11	55.6	10	28.6	2	
19 years	21.7	5	22.2	4	42.9	3	
20 years	13.0	3	11.1	2	14.3	1	
21 years & older	8.7	2	11.1	2	14.3	1	
<u>Race</u>							6.82*
Caucasian	91.3	21	77.8	14	100	7	
African American	0	0	11.1	2	0	0	
Asian American	4.3	1	5.6	1	0	0	
Latin American	4.3	1	0	0	0	0	
Other	0	0	5.6	1	0	0	

Note. The * = not significant, $p > .05$. A number of cells did not have a minimum expected count of 5. Howell (2002) suggests that this does not pose a problem since Type 1 error usually does not exceed .06 even in a total sample size of 20.

Table 2.

Religious, number of relationships, and living situation by group

Measure	<u>Control</u>		<u>Harassing</u>		<u>Stalking</u>		χ^2
	%	n	%	n	%	n	
<u>Religious</u>							.68 *
Practicing religion	56.5	13	61.1	11	42.9	3	
Not practicing	43.5	10	38.9	7	57.1	4	
<u>Number of relationships</u>							8.94*
One relationship	56.5	13	38.9	7	0	0	
Two relationships	21.7	5	38.9	7	42.9	3	
Three relationships	13.0	3	16.7	3	28.6	2	
Over three relationships	8.6	2	5.6	1	28.6	2	
<u>Living situation</u>							2.37*
Living at home with parents	4.3	1	11.1	2	14.3	1	
Living with a roommate	91.3	21	77.8	14	85.7	6	
Living alone	4.3	1	11.1	2	0	0	

Note. The * = not significant, $p > .05$. A number of cells did not have a minimum expected count of 5. Howell (2002) suggests that this does not pose a problem since Type 1 error usually does not exceed .06 even in a total sample size of 20.

Table 3.

Living location, work, class standing, alcohol and drug use by group

Measure	<u>Control</u>		<u>Harassing</u>		<u>Stalking</u>		χ^2
	%	n	%	n	%	n	
<u>Living location</u>							3.39*
Living in a house	8.7	2	11.1	2	28.6	2	
Living in a dorm	56.5	13	61.1	11	57.1	4	
Living in an apartment	30.4	7	27.8	5	14.3	1	
Other living arrangements	4.3	1	0	0	0	0	
<u>Work status</u>							4.14 *
Full-time work	0	0	5.6	1	0	0	
Part-time work	43.5	10	22.2	4	28.6	2	
No work	47.8	11	72.2	13	71.4	5	
<u>Class standing</u>							2.95*
Freshman	52.2	12	61.1	11	42.9	3	
Sophomore	21.7	5	22.2	4	28.6	2	
Junior	13	3	11.1	2	28.6	2	
Senior	13	3	5.6	1	0	0	
<u>Alcohol use</u>							4.31*
Drink	65.2	15	83.3	15	100	7	
Don't drink	34.8	8	16.7	3	0	0	

<u>Drug use</u>					2.17*	
Use drugs	8.7	2	22.2	4	28.6	2
Don't use drugs	91.3	21	77.8	14	71.4	5

Note. The * = not significant, $p > .05$. A number of cells did not have a minimum expected count of 5. Howell (2002) suggests that this does not pose a problem since Type 1 error usually does not exceed .06 even in a total sample size of 20.

Table 4.

Attachment style by group

Style	Control (n =23) %	Harassing (n =18) %	Stalking (n =7) %	χ^2
<u>Attachment style</u>				
Secure	26.1	22.2	14.3	.43*
Insecure	73.9	88.8	85.7	
Secure	26.1	22.2	14.3	.90*
Fearful	30.4	33.3	28.6	
Preoccupied	17.4	22.2	42.8	
Dismissing	26.1	22.2	14.3	

Note. The percentage given is within each group condition. The * = not significant, $p > .05$. A number of cells did not have a minimum expected count of 5. Howell (2002) suggests that this does not pose a problem since Type 1 error usually does not exceed .06 even in a total sample size of 20.

Table 5.

Motivation by group

Motive	<u>Control (n =22)</u> %	<u>Harassing (n =16)</u> %	<u>Stalking (n =7)</u> %	χ^2
<u>Initial motive (n=45)</u>				8.35*
Win Back	27	31.3	0	
Staying friends	27	25	43	
Explanation	27	25	29	
Exchanging items	4.5	0	0	
Settle issues	4.5	12.5	14	
Lonely	10	0	14	
Other	0	6.2	0	
	<u>Control (n=12)</u> %	<u>Harassing (n=11)</u> %	<u>Stalking (n=4)</u> %	χ^2
<u>Changed motive (n=27)</u>				16.39*
Win Back	0	9.1	25	
Staying friends	58.3	36.3	0	
Explanation	0	9.1	0	
Exchanging items	8.3	9.1	0	
Settle issues	16.8	18.2	25	
Revenge	0	0	25	
Lonely	8.3	0	25	
Other	8.3	18.2	0	-

Note. The percentage given is within each group condition. The * = not significant, $p > .05$. A number of cells did not have a minimum expected count of 5. Howell (2002) suggests that this does not pose a problem since Type 1 error usually does not exceed .06 even in a total sample size of 20.

Table 6.

RMA, and ASBM data by group

Measure	<u>Control (n=23)</u>		<u>Harassing (n=18)</u>		<u>Stalking (n=7)</u>		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	<i>F</i> (2, 45)
RMA	37.35	9.35	41.05	11.13	38.71	13.76	.60
ASBM	44.26	10.32	45.39	9.39	49.57	10.60	.75

Note. RMA= Rape Myth Acceptance Questionnaire, ASBM= Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Modified.

Table 7.

Criminal thinking style scales by group from the PICTS

Scale	<u>Control (n =23)</u>		<u>Harassing (n =18)</u>		<u>Stalking (n =7)</u>		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	<i>F</i> (2, 45)
Mollification	42.0 ^a	4.5	47.8 ^b	9.0	50.3 ^b	10.6	4.79**
Cut off	41.4	8.4	46.1	8.5	47	11.8	1.82
Entitlement	40.5 ^a	5.1	45.7 ^b	7.9	45.1 ^{ab}	4.9	3.87*
Power orientation	44.3 ^a	6.2	51.9 ^b	7.8	52.7 ^b	5.1	8.16**
Sentimentality	43.0	8.2	43.3	8.4	44.6	9.9	.10
Superoptimism	38.3	3.1	41.4	8.7	42.4	6.6	1.84
Cognitive indolence	45.4	7.86	50.2	10.2	46.0	11.6	1.4
Discontinuity	41.6	7.1	45.5	11.3	45.6	9.4	1.1

Note. * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$, also means with the same superscripts are not significantly different from each other with a LSD post hoc test

Table 8.

Content, Factor and Special scales by group from the PICTS

Scale	<u>Control (n =23)</u>		<u>Harassing (n =18)</u>		<u>Stalking (n =7)</u>		<i>F</i> (2.45)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Current Criminal Thinking	45.1	7.8	48.9	9.5	46.9	10.5	.92
Historical criminal thinking	35.3 ^a	2.7	39.1 ^b	7.2	40.7 ^b	7.8	3.74*
Problem avoidance	45.4	7.2	48.7	10.0	47.0	8.8	.74
Interpersonal hostility	44.6 ^a	3.5	47.7 ^b	4.3	45.4 ^{ab}	4.0	3.31*
Self-assertion	38.0 ^a	3.4	41.6 ^{ab}	8.0	44.0 ^b	8.0	3.26*
Denial of harm	43.5	8.6	48.6	9.1	46.9	11.9	1.57
Fear of change	57.0	9.5	58.9	13.7	53.6	6.7	.61

Note. * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$, also means with the same superscripts are not significantly different from each other with a LSD post hoc test