

IN PURSUIT OF FACTORS THAT PREDICT STALKING PERPETRATION AND
VICTIMIZATION AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

By

KATHLEEN A. FOX

A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2006

Copyright 2006

by

Kathleen A. Fox

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I owe many thanks to the members of this thesis committee: Dr. Angela R. Gover, Dr. Nicole Leeper-Piquero, and Dr. Eve Brank for their time, effort, and willingness to guide and direct this thesis. While each committee member offered insightful contributions, I am especially grateful for the truly exceptional guidance and insight from my mentor and thesis chair, Dr. Angela R. Gover. Dr. Gover has gone above and beyond the call of duty as mentor by offering her friendship, providing me with opportunities, and inspiring my continued interest in academia.

I am also indebted to my parents, Bob and Janet Fox, for their tremendous support of my academic interests and to my sister, Laura Fox, for keeping me sane.

I would like to dedicate this document to Chris Talbot, who has been with me every step of the way.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ABSTRACT	vii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
History of the Problem.....	5
Legislative Review	6
Definition of Stalking	11
Prevalence of Stalking	16
Victimization	16
Perpetration.....	17
Prior Research Among College Samples.....	20
Factors that Predict Stalking Victimization and Perpetration.....	22
3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	28
4 METHODOLOGY	38
Procedure	38
Research Questions.....	39
Dependent Variables.....	39
Independent Variables	41
Analytic Plan	46
5 RESULTS	48
Overall Sample Description.....	48
Descriptive Analysis.....	50
Characteristics of Stalking Victims	50
Characteristics of Stalking Perpetrators	51
Bivariate Relationships.....	51

Multivariate Analysis.....	53
6 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	58
APPENDIX	
A POTENTIAL STALKING BEHAVIORS	71
B SURVEY	72
LIST OF REFERENCES	83
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	92

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>page</u>
5-1 Descriptive Statistics of Variables (Full Sample; N=1,490)	49
5-2 Correlation Matrix (Full Sample; N=1,490)	52
5-3 Logistic Regression Predicting Stalking Perpetration (Full Sample; N = 1,420)	54
5-4 Logistic Regression Predicting Stalking Victimization (Full Sample; N = 1,365) ..	55
5-5 Logistic Regression Predicting Stalking Victimization (Females Only; N = 907) ..	56
5-6 Logistic Regression Predicting Stalking Victimization (Males Only; N = 458)	56

Abstract of Thesis Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

IN PURSUIT OF FACTORS THAT PREDICT STALKING PERPETRATION AND
VICTIMIZATION AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

By

Kathleen A. Fox

May 2006

Chair: Angela R. Gover

Major Department: Criminology, Law and Society

Stalking has only recently been labeled a crime although it has long been a cause for social concern. Empirical research suggests that there are numerous adverse consequences of stalking victimization, including heightened anxiety, panic attacks, and post-traumatic stress symptoms. Celebrity cases of stalking have ignited recent stalking legislation and empirical research, both of which are in developmental stages. Research, although scarce, suggests certain risk factors increase one's likelihood of victimization or perpetration of stalking. This study examines the influence of predictive factors on stalking victimization or perpetration among 1,490 college students at the University of Florida. Participants responded to questions measuring stalking victimization and perpetration as well as questions measuring demographic information, attitudes, lifestyle behaviors, and personal characteristics. Logistic regression models were estimated to identify factors that predict the likelihood of becoming a stalking victim or perpetrator. Findings indicate that factors that significantly influence stalking perpetration do not vary

by gender; however, factors that significantly predict stalking victimization do vary by gender. Exposure to violence in the family of origin emerged as the strongest predictor of stalking perpetration and victimization. Policy implications from this research and recommendations for future research are discussed.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Stalking is a crime that has only recently been recognized as a legal term, a criminal offense, and an interest for research (Bjerregaard, 2000; Davis & Frieze, 2000; Davis, Ace, & Andra, 2000; Langhinrichsen-Rohling & Rohling, 2000). Celebrity victims of stalking initially captured media attention, which quickly lead to an unprecedented explosion of legal action against the perpetration of unwanted pursuit behavior (Perez, 1993). Because stalking has only been considered a crime since 1990,¹ research investigating the issues surrounding stalking victimization and perpetration is still in developmental stages.

Empirical research has determined victims of stalking often experience adverse short- and long-term consequences from exposure to the repeated, harassing, and frightening stalking behaviors. Serious emotional effects of stalking victimization include feelings of paranoia, fear, anxiety, and post-traumatic stress symptoms (Hall, 1998; Pathé & Mullen, 1997). Stalking victims also report experiencing harmful physical symptoms such as appetite disturbance, headaches, asthma attacks, persistent nausea, and chronic sleep disturbance (Pathé & Mullen, 1997). Spitzberg and Cupach (2003) compiled a comprehensive record of injurious consequences found by many other researchers to be associated with stalking victimization. Negative effects of exposure to stalking victimization include increased aggression, lowered quality of life, onset of

¹ California was the first state to recognize stalking as a crime (California Penal Code § 646.9 [1990]).

nightmares, and suicidal thoughts (Spitzberg & Cupach, 2003). It is clear that victims of stalking are exposed to distressing and traumatic harassment from their perpetrators, which leads to damaging outcomes. Therefore, stalking is an important issue for social concern due to the numerous adverse consequences experienced by individuals who are stalked.

The National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS), conducted by Tjaden and Thoennes (1998), was the first national survey of women's experiences with stalking and emotional, physical, and sexual violence. The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) and the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control sponsored the NVAWS. This groundbreaking study was conducted using random digit dialing from November 1995 to May 1996 and resulted in a sample of 8,000 men and 8,000 women. This study remains as the largest sample for stalking research to date. Tjaden and Thoennes (1998, pp. 1) define stalking as "harassing or threatening behavior that an individual engages in repeatedly, such as following a person, appearing at a person's home or place of business, making harassing phone calls, leaving written messages or objects, or vandalizing a person's property."²

Several studies have investigated the extent to which predictive factors influence the risk of becoming a victim or perpetrator of stalking. Prior empirical research has explored the effects of factors such as residing off-campus versus on-campus for college students (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2002; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1999), current relationship status (Fisher et al., 2002), race (Bjerregaard, 2000; Fisher et al., 2002; McCreedy & Dennis, 1996; Meloy & Gothard, 1995; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1999),

² Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) define stalking in their survey as repeatedly experiencing any of nine indicators (see survey in Appendix B).

engaging in sexually risky behavior (Haugaard & Seri, 2001, 2003, 2004), and the use of drugs and alcohol (Logan, Leukfeld, & Walker, 2000; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1999). In addition, a number of researchers have examined gender differences among stalking victims' and perpetrators' propensity to exhibit specific risk factors (Bjerregaard, 2000; Cupach & Spitzberg, 2000; Davis & Frieze, 2000; Dye & Davis, 2003; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Palarea, Cohen, & Rohling, 2000; Logan et al., 2000; McCreedy & Dennis, 1996). Although investigations of predictive factors that place potential victims and perpetrators at risk of stalking are limited, these empirical studies have successfully identified predictive factors that significantly influence the likelihood of stalking perpetration and victimization.

The current research uses stalking questions from the NVAWS and explores the relationship between factors that influence the risk of stalking victimization and perpetration among college students. This study makes three important contributions to the stalking literature. The first contribution of the current study is its focus on retesting influential risk factors that predict stalking victimization and perpetration among college students. In addition to assessing the predictive ability of risk factors that other studies have begun to examine, the current study investigates the predictive ability of several concepts that have never before been examined with stalking, including attitudes toward women, child abuse, and a theoretical test of self-control. Theoretical tests of stalking behavior are severely limited and Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) general theory of crime has never before been applied to stalking perpetration or victimization.

The second important contribution this study makes to the literature is its application of measures from the largest national stalking study (NVAWS) to a college

sample. The utilization of stalking measures from the NVAWS enables the current study to compare stalking behaviors of college students to stalking behaviors in the general public. Third, this study is the second largest sample to examine stalking behavior among college students (N = 1,490) to date.³ Most studies examining stalking among college students have used smaller samples involving two to three hundred participants (Coleman, 1997; Cupach & Spitzberg, 2000; Dye & Davis, 2003; Langhinrichsen-Rohling & Rohling, 2000; Sheridan, Gillett, Davies, Blaauw, & Patel, 2003; Sinclair & Frieze, 2000; Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999). Due to the fact that victimization or perpetration of stalking is somewhat of a rare event, it is important to use a large sample to capture an adequate number of individuals to make appropriate and meaningful inferences.

The following chapter reviews prior literature on stalking and discusses the history of the problem, legislative review, definitional issues, prevalence of stalking victimization and perpetration, prior research among college samples, and factors that predict stalking. The third chapter reviews the application of two theoretical approaches used in prior research to explain stalking and discusses the new application of Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) general theory of crime to stalking. The fourth chapter discusses the methodology used in the current study followed by the fifth chapter detailing results of the analysis. A discussion and conclusion section will follow and include policy implications and recommendations for future research.

³ The largest study was conducted by Fisher et al. (2002) and involved a sample of 4,446 college students.

CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

History of the Problem

Stalking has only been recognized as a crime and as a serious social problem for sixteen years. Before 1990, no country, state, or society had statutes that recognized stalking as illegal behavior (Perez, 1993). This is not to suggest stalking behavior did not exist prior to 1990. Meloy (1999) acknowledges that stalking has always existed in society among human relationships. Prior to the implementation of stalking legislation, many behaviors indicative of stalking were legally considered as harassment. Interestingly, the media's portrayal of celebrity stalking was the catalyst that first exposed the existence of intrusive behavior and ignited global attention. The actress Jodie Foster was a victim of celebrity stalking whose case was one of the first to receive media attention. Her stalker, John Hinckley, Jr., was inspired by Jodie Foster's movie *Taxi Driver* to shoot President Ronald Reagan on March 30, 1981 in an attempt to gain recognition and, ultimately, love from the actress. The stalking of Teresa Saldana, famous television actress on the set of *The Commish*, was also among the first to gain widespread attention. On March 15, 1982 her pursuer, Arthur Richard Jackson, lay in wait outside her apartment and violently stabbed her until a bystander came to her rescue (Perez, 1993). Although numerous celebrities and the public have been stalked in the past, one particular case of celebrity stalking instantly captured the media's attention and resulted in worldwide news coverage of astronomical proportions. Rebecca Schaeffer, a famous actress who appeared in the television program *My Sister Sam*, was stalked for

two years by Robert Bardo before he shot and murdered her outside her apartment on July 18, 1989 (Perez, 1993).

The media has also recognized politicians and other public figures as victims of unwanted pursuit behavior (Dietz, Matthews, Van Duyne, Martell, Parry, Stewart, Warren, & Crowder, 1991; Dietz, Matthews, Martell, Steward, Hrouda, & Warren, 1991). Celebrity and political cases tend to be more highly publicized than other cases of stalking (see Holmes [1993] for an extensive list of celebrity stalking victims). Although celebrities were first recognized as victims of stalking, this crime also affects individuals who are not publicly well known. The following review of the laws on stalking will provide the foundation on which to build legal and research definitions as well as new developments within the literature.

Legislative Review

California was the first state within the United States to enact stalking legislation (California Penal Code § 646.9 [1990]). This law defined stalking as the “willful, malicious, and repeated following or harassing” of another person (California Penal Code § 646.9 [1990]). By 1995, an incredibly short five years later, all fifty states and the District of Columbia followed suit and implemented stalking legislation. Although all fifty states enacted stalking legislation, legal definitions of stalking vary among each state. Many states generally follow California’s definition of stalking and several states (such as Idaho, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and West Virginia) have implemented an identical reproduction of parts of the California stalking law (Idaho Code § 18-7905 [1992]; Louisiana Rev. Stat. Ann. § 14:40.2 [1992]; Mississippi Code Ann. 97-3-107 [1992]; Oklahoma Stat. Ann. Tit. 21, § 1173 [1992]; South Dakota Codified Laws Ann. § 22-19A-1 to -7 [1992]; West Virginia Code § 61-2-9a [1992]).

While some states consider stalking as either a misdemeanor (Kentucky) or a felony (Illinois and Indiana), other states offer varying degrees of legal punishments including both misdemeanors and felonies (Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Minnesota, and Missouri) (Connecticut General Statute § 53a-181c [1992]; Florida Section § 784.048 [1992]; Georgia Code Ann. § 16-5-90 [1993]; Illinois III. Ann. Stat. Ch. 720, para. 5/12-7.3 [1992]; Indiana Code § 35-45-10-5 [1993]; Kentucky Rev. Stat. Ann. § 508.130-.150 [1992]; Minnesota Stat. Ann. § 609.749 [1993]; Missouri Ann. Stat. § 565.225 [1993]). Further, some states require an element of threat (Alabama Code § 13A-6-90 [1992]) while other states maintain no credible threat is needed for the crime of stalking (Florida Section § 784.048 [1992]; Missouri Ann. Stat. § 565.225 [1993]).

Cyberstalking is any type of “electronic communication” in which the perpetrator engages in repeatedly to willfully and maliciously harass and stalk an individual (California Penal Code § 646.9 [1990]). Examples of cyberstalking behavior can include repeated and unwanted instant messaging, emailing, or computer hacking into private electronic accounts. Several states have included cyberstalking activities with their definition of stalking (California Penal Code § 646.9 [1990]; Michigan Stat. Ann. 28.643(8), Michigan Comp. Laws Ann. § 750.411h [1993]; Missouri Ann. Stat. § 565.225 [1993]; New Jersey Stat. Ann. § 2C: 12-10 [1993]; and North Carolina Gen. Stat. §14-277.3 [1993]), whereas most states have not included cyberstalking as part of the legal definition of stalking.

Several states include the perpetrator’s harassment to the victim’s immediate family as a violation of the legal definition of stalking (Idaho Code § 18-7905 [1992]; Louisiana Rev. Stat. Ann. § 14:40.2 [1992]; Maine Rev. Stat. Ann. 17-A § 210 [1993];

New Mexico Stat. Ann. § 30-3A3 [1993]; and Utah Code Ann. § 76-5-106.5 [1992]), while most states do not allow unwanted pursuit behaviors toward the victims family members to be included in the legal definition of stalking. While the majority of states are quite vague as to the types of behaviors that represent stalking, a small number of states list specific unwanted pursuit behaviors as an example of stalking conduct (Alaska Statute § 11.41.260 [1993]; Colorado Rev. Statute § 18-9-111 [1995]). Specific behaviors from the perpetrator elicit more severe punishments among some states. For example, many jurisdictions increase the criminal charge and/or punishment if the stalking perpetrator has been charged more than once for the crime of stalking, uses or carries a deadly weapon while stalking, stalks a minor under the age of sixteen years old, or is in violation of parole or a protective order set forth by the victim (Alaska Statute § 11.41.260 [1993]; Connecticut Section § 53a-181c [1992]; Hawaii Rev. Statute § 711-1106 [1992]; Utah Code Ann. § 76-5-106.5 [1992]). The state of Minnesota increases the stalking perpetrator's charge to an aggravated violation (a felony) if the perpetrator has falsely impersonated another individual or has discriminatorily stalked the victim based on his/her "race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, disability, ...age, or national origin" (Minnesota Stat. Ann. § 609.749 [1993]). The state of Louisiana legally requires all stalking perpetrators to undergo a psychiatric evaluation (Louisiana Rev. Stat. Section 14:40.2).

A handful of states authorized certain victim rights in their legal code. For example, the state of Georgia requires that victims be notified upon the release or escape of their stalker from incarceration (Georgia Code Ann. § 16-5-90 [1993]). North Carolina and Oklahoma have both enacted new laws establishing 'Address

Confidentiality Programs' that allow state government agencies to keep confidential the addresses of victims of stalking (North Carolina Gen. Stat. §14-277.3 [1993]; Oklahoma Stat. Ann. Tit. 21, § 1173 [1992]).

With all the inconsistencies and variations among all fifty states, there is a clear need for thorough and standardized stalking legislation. The Federal Government attempted to provide legal guidance for the states to model, however each state's stalking legislation still varies considerably. The United States Federal Government later recognized stalking as a crime in 1996, as part of the Violence Against Women Act established earlier in 1994 (Title IV of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, Public Law 103-322). The Federal Government's legal recognition of stalking occurred one year after all fifty states officially implemented individual stalking laws.

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) evaluated the stalking legislation of each state and developed stalking code recommendations based on perceived problems and oversights within individual state legislation. The NIJ published 'A Model Antistalking Code for the States' for purposes of providing states with written guidelines and to promote the adoption of these federally recommended stalking statutes (National Institute of Justice, 1996). The Model Antistalking Code for the States from the NIJ was an official recommendation for each state to change state statutes to mirror that of the Model Code due to inconsistent and, often, incomprehensive state statutes. Although some states have already begun to amend their original stalking code to include elements discussed in the Model Antistalking Code for the States, many state laws have yet to model stalking legislation after the federal guidelines. Because the Model Antistalking

Code for the States was published only ten years ago, the full effect of the federal stalking guidance on state legislation still remains unknown.

The Model Code report details a definition of stalking that requires an element of fear and also considers criminal the stalking or harassing of the victim's family by the perpetrator (National Institute of Justice, 1996). According to the NIJ (1996), most states require the existence of three fundamental elements before an individual may be charged and convicted of stalking, including (1) a course of conduct (a pattern of behavior), (2) the presence of threats, and (3) criminal intent to cause fear in the victim. These elements specified by the Department of Justice are quite broad and are often only a portion of what may be required by individual states. For example, in addition to other elements, some states mandate that direct threats must be made to the victim before the crime of stalking has been committed whereas other states consider both indirect and direct threats to be sufficient in meeting the threat requirement. The Model Antistalking Code for the States does not necessitate a credible threat be made by the stalking perpetrator and asserts that stalkers engage in predatory behavior that, taken together, would cause a reasonable person fear (National Institute of Justice, 1996).

Although threats are not necessary for the Federal Government's classification of stalking, the Model Antistalking Code for the States recommends that an element of fear be experienced by the victim. Specific stalking behaviors are deliberately absent from the Model Antistalking Code for the States due to the impossibly long list of potential stalking behaviors perpetrators may perform and the desire to not restrict the types of pursuit and harassment that can be interpreted as stalking. The Model Antistalking Code for the States advocates implementation of both felony and misdemeanor charges for

stalking perpetrators, depending on the severity of the crime (National Institute of Justice, 1996).

By the beginning of 2000, only a decade after the first stalking law was passed, several other countries (including the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia) had initiated or enhanced anti-stalking legislation. Although the United States and several other countries have recently and quickly implemented stalking legislation, a large number of countries have not yet established legal descriptions of stalking (Sheridan, Davies, & Boon, 2001).

Although states vary considerably as to the elements included in their stalking legislation, all states require stalking behavior to be harassing, repeated, and unwanted. Because stalking legislation is still changing and improving across state jurisdictions, it is anticipated that legal definitions of stalking will become more alike in the future.

Definition of Stalking

In light of the fact that the empirical study of stalking is in developmental stages, it is important to note that a standard definition of stalking does not yet exist in research. Because a substantial portion of stalking occurs in connection with an intimate dating relationship (before, during, or after an established relationship, or in an attempt to begin an intimate relationship) (Brewster, 2000; Haugaard & Seri, 2001; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998), it is necessary to address the difference between courtship behavior and stalking behavior. Stalking behaviors within an intimate relationship exist on a continuum with one end being typical dating conduct and the other end being intrusive stalking (Cupach & Spitzberg, 1998). For example, after the dissolution of an intimate relationship one partner puts effort into re-establishing the relationship by repeatedly calling and visiting

their ex-partner who considers the behaviors unwanted. This is an example of the fine line between stalking and a common attempt to rekindle a lost love.

Psychologists and psychiatrists have debated the mental and emotional status of stalkers. The literature is mixed regarding the classification of stalkers as mentally ill. *The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, Fourth Edition (DSM-IV) (American Psychiatric Association, 1994) defines psychological disorders but does not include any identification of stalking perpetration. Zona, Palarea, and Lane (1998) contend that although the DSM-IV does not clearly classify stalking perpetration as a psychological disorder, many stalkers exhibit a number of other mental illness symptoms that are specified in the DSM-IV. For example, the DSM-IV describes major mental disorders, all of which stalkers may suffer from, such as thought disorders, mood disorders, personality disorders, and substance abuse (Zona et al., 1998). Zona et al. (1998) reveal that 63% of their sample of stalking offenders have suffered from a significant mental illness (either a personality disorder or other mental disorder). Some researchers (Dietz et al., 1991) openly assume the stalkers they have studied are mentally ill. Other researchers have mixed findings and determine mental illness is found to play only a small role in the pursuit and murder of public figures (Fein & Vossekuil, 1998). Still other researchers declare stalking perpetrators are not mentally ill (Meloy, 1998; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) found only 7% of victims report their stalkers were either mentally ill or abusing drugs or alcohol. There is still no clear consensus among researchers as to the mental soundness of stalking perpetrators.

Previous research has used an array of definitions for the phenomenon widely known as stalking. Although an accepted definition for stalking does not yet exist, most

research encompasses the same basic tenets. At a very basic level, the dictionary defines stalking as the stealthy search and pursuit of prey (Merriam-Webster, 2003). This definition, however, is an insufficient characterization of the series of behaviors that comprise stalking because it omits important stalking behaviors and includes behaviors that would not be considered stalking. Researchers have struggled to compose a clear and concise definition of stalking that provides enough detail to sufficiently determine the specific behaviors and actions that describe the act of stalking, but that does not include an overabundance of limiting elements. Most definitions of stalking have been broad, such as “the act of following, viewing, communicating with, or moving threateningly or menacingly toward another person” (Wright, Burgess, Burgess, Laszlo, McCreary, & Douglas, 1996, pp. 487) and definitions typically require the presence of intrusive and harassing behaviors on two or more occasions (Sheridan, Gillet, & Davies, 2002). Meloy and Gothard (1995, pp. 258) use the same description of stalking as California’s legal definition (California Penal Code § 646.9 [1990]) and classify stalking as “the willful, malicious, and repeated following and harassing of another person that threatens his or her safety.”

While most researchers define stalking, others have chosen to exclude a definitive description of the construct by allowing research participants to interpret individual definitions (Emerson, Ferris, & Gardner, 1998; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1999). Some definitions of stalking include components of intent, fear, threats, and danger (Bjerregaard, 2000; White, Kowalski, Lyndon, & Valentine 2000). Overall, the majority of research relies upon a definition of stalking that stresses *repeated* negative behavior in which the perpetrator pursues the victim on two or more occasions and in which the

victim perceives the behavior as undesirable. Therefore, based on this assumption, stalking does not exist if the behavior occurs only once and if the victim perceives the behavior and relationship as positive.

In the midst of the academic and legal debate about definitional issues and variations of the classification of stalking, several other terms have been developed by empirical research to either replace or supplement the term “stalking.” Several scholars intentionally avoid use of the term “stalking,” implying that individuals often have misconceptions, misinterpretations, and preconceived notions of the word and, therefore, the use of the term “stalking” may not be an appropriate label for the desired outcome. Other scholars argue that the use of the term “stalking” limits the breadth of behaviors respondents should consider as negative and intrusive (Haugaard & Seri, 2003). Other terms that have been used to refer to stalking, but are comprised with different definitions, include obsessional following (Meloy, 1996), obsessive relational intrusions (Spitzberg & Cupach, 2003), obsessional harassment (Rosenfeld, 2004), unwanted pursuit behaviors (Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2000), and intrusive contact (Haugaard & Seri, 2003). The use of these terms have considerably added to the complication of defining a standard definition of stalking because introducing a new term with a corresponding new definition may render the comparison and replication of research findings difficult and/or impossible. The addition of new stalking-related terms and definitions may, however, provide beneficial contributions to the literature by introducing alternatives to the confusion associated with the term “stalking.” Using alternative stalking terms may also avoid the need to consider legal variations across different jurisdictions. Implementing the use of new terms to replace “stalking” appears to best

suit research testing specific concepts that may not legally qualify as stalking (such as pursuit behaviors that do not occur repeatedly). The conjecture that the term “stalking” may alter research participants’ responses, and therefore may be inappropriate for research purposes, has been challenged. Phillips, Quirk, Rosenfeld, and O’Connor (2004) report that respondents did not appear to be influenced by use of the word “stalking” as opposed to the phrase “followed (i.e., more than once) and/or harassed by another person” because the proportion of respondents indicating prior victimization of “stalking” versus repeated following and harassing remained the same.

The term “stalking” appears to be a single name for a vast range of behaviors (See Appendix A for a partial list of stalking behavior). Stalking can consist of behaviors that range from following, watching, and covertly obtaining information to more dangerous behaviors such as sexual coerciveness, physical violence, and murder. Although the literature on stalking has not come to a clear consensus of what precise elements constitute stalking, the vast majority of research seems to embrace several standard aspects. Most research requires stalking behavior to be intrusive, unwanted, repeated, and frightening or harassing in nature (Haugaard & Seri, 2003; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). Therefore, the current study will rely on these descriptive elements to define stalking. This study employs the NVAWS definition of stalking, which refers to “harassing or threatening behavior that an individual engages in repeatedly, such as following a person, appearing at a person’s home or place of business, making harassing phone calls, [or] leaving written messages or objects or vandalize a person’s property (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998, pp. 1).”

Because stalking is still in developmental stages with regard to research and legal attention it is likely that empirical research will continue to address definitional issues. As research interest in stalking continues to grow and as legal progress changes and improves, it is anticipated that research definitions and laws addressing stalking will become more sophisticated and homogenous in the future.

Prevalence of Stalking

Victimization

Prior research estimates prevalence rates of stalking victimization to be between 6% and 27% for college students (Logan et al., 2000; McCreedy & Dennis, 1996). Although stalking was originally considered to be a crime that affected only women, research has shown men are also stalking victims. However, women are still targeted by stalkers at a higher rate than men. Average rates of stalking victimization range from 13% to 30% for female college students (Fisher et al., 2002; Fremouw, Westrup, & Pennypacker, 1997) and 11% to 19% for male college students (Bjerregaard, 2000; Haugaard & Seri, 2001). These alarmingly high rates of stalking victimization among college students warrant further investigation for purposes of ascertaining specific predictive factors of this behavior.

It is important to compare stalking prevalence rates of college students to rates among the general population to better determine the extent of occurrences, potential risk factors unique to both groups, and the ability to generalize rates among college students to rates in the general population. Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) analyzed data from a national sample of 8,000 women and 8,000 men using both narrow and broad definitions of stalking. The findings from the more restrictive definition, requiring the victim to feel a *great amount of fear*, revealed 8% of women and 2% of men report stalking

victimization. When the broader definition of stalking was used, requiring victims to feel only *somewhat fearful*, the prevalence rate for stalking victimization increased to 12% for female respondents and doubled to 4% for males.

Samples of college students report stalking victimization at much higher rates than the general public (Bjerregaard, 2000; Fisher et al., 2002; McCreedy & Dennis, 1996; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). It is possible that college students are more likely to be victimized than individuals in the general population or that college students who are victimized by stalking are more likely to report these experiences compared to individuals in the general population who are victimized by stalking. Many researchers argue college students are more likely to experience stalking, reflected by the higher rates of victimization among college students compared to findings among the general population, such as the NVAWS (Bjerregaard, 2000; Fisher et al., 2002). Several studies have found younger people, and especially college students, are at a higher risk for experiencing stalking (Bjerregaard, 2000; Tjaden et al., 2000). Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) report 64% of their national sample who had been victimized by stalking were first stalked before the age of twenty-nine. In light of these findings, attention should be shifted toward investigating factors that place college students at an increased risk for stalking victimization.

Perpetration

Previous research on stalking perpetration among college students and among the general population is more limited than research on stalking victimization. Of the studies that have investigated the prevalence of stalking perpetration, most have found lower rates of perpetration in comparison with reported rates of victimization. Stalking perpetration rates reported by college students range from 1% (Fremouw et al., 1997) to

8% (Haugaard & Seri, 2003). Haugaard and Seri (2003) report that 7% of females and 11% of males from a sample of 631 college students admitted to perpetrating stalking behaviors.

Davis et al. (2000) report that 30% and 36% of respondents from two college samples reported perpetrating between one and five acts of stalking. As previously discussed, legal definitions of stalking requires *two or more* pursuit behaviors to exist before the crime of stalking has been committed. The fact that these researchers founds such a high percentage of respondents reporting stalking perpetration may be attributed to many individuals committing only one act of stalking-like behavior. For descriptive purposes, these researchers chose to overlook the legal requirement of repeated behavior; however, the statistical analyses for perpetration in this research are based on individuals who have committed more than one stalking behavior. These researchers further state between 7% and 10% (for two separate samples) of college students reported perpetrating between six and twenty-three stalking acts. This group of stalking perpetrators meets the generally accepted requirements for stalking (committing at least two intrusive behaviors), and yield a surprisingly higher rate of stalking perpetration than has been typically reported.

Similar to research on stalking perpetration among college students, large-scale studies examining stalking perpetration within the general public are also more limited compared to stalking victimization research. The only studies measuring stalking perpetration among samples of non-college participants have examined samples of convicted stalkers (Logan, Nigoff, Walker, & Jordon, 2002; Meloy, 1996; Mullen, Pathè, Purcell, & Stuart, 1999; Schwartz-Watts & Morgan, 1998), batterers and stalkers

(Burgess, Baker, Greening, Hartman, Burgess, Douglas, & Halloran, 1997; Burgess, Harner, Baker, Hartman, & Lole, 2001), and case studies of stalkers (Kurt, 1995). Some studies collected data on stalking perpetration in the general population from samples of stalking victims (Brewster, 2000; Emerson et al., 1998).

The nature of the relationship between stalking victim and perpetrator has been investigated using samples from the general public. Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) report the majority of stalking victims know their perpetrator. Further, this research finds only 23% of women and 36% of males report being stalked by strangers. Of the studies that surveyed stalking victims, between 29% (Pathè & Mullen, 1997) and 92% (Brewster, 2000) of victims were pursued by a current or former intimate partner. Pathè and Mullen (1997) report 21% of stalking victims were stalked by an acquaintance and 16% by a stranger. Similarly, Sheridan et al. (2001) found 37% of victims were pursued by an acquaintance and 12% by a stranger. In one study of stalking perpetrators, 30% report pursuing an ex-partner, 19% acknowledge they stalked an acquaintance, 14% confess to stalking a stranger, and 23% admit to stalking an individual with whom they had a professional relationship (Mullen et al., 1999).

Research has shown younger individuals, including college students, report stalking victimization and perpetration at higher levels than older individuals. Overall, empirical research indicates both men and women experience stalking victimization and perpetration. Prior research also reveals females are victimized by stalking more often than males, and males report stalking perpetration more often than females.

Prior Research Among College Samples

The largest sample size used in stalking prior research among college students involved 4,446 female college students and focused specifically on victimization (Fisher et al., 2002). The largest sample size used to research stalking perpetration among college students surveyed 631 respondents (Haugaard & Seri, 2003). The most common stalking behavior reported in nearly all prior research of stalking among college students is unwanted phone calls. On average, between 63% and 91% of stalking victims indicated experiencing unwanted and repeated phone calls from their stalker (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2000; Haugaard & Seri, 2003). Other common stalking behaviors reported by victims include perpetrators waiting outside or inside places, following, and unsolicited in-person conversations (Fisher et al., 2002; Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2000).

Several studies have examined the nature of the relationship between stalking victims and perpetrators among college students. Results indicate victims report being stalked by individuals they know well (current or prior intimate partner or friend) and individuals they do not know well (acquaintance or stranger). Of the studies involving college students, there is an overall consensus that many victims know their stalkers well. In fact, between 40% (McCreeley & Dennis, 1996) and 100% (Haugaard & Seri, 2001) of victims knew their stalker well. Fremouw et al. (1997) report between 40% and 47% of female stalking victims are pursued by a former partner. Similarly, Bjerregaard (2000) finds 41% of female victims and 41% of male victims were stalked by an ex-partner. Spitzberg and Rhea (1999) report 34% of their college sample experienced obsessional relational intrusive victimization (experiencing non-threatening unwanted pursuit behaviors) by an ex-partner, 38% reported the perpetrator as a friend, and 25% identified the pursuer as an acquaintance. Research by Haugaard and Seri (2001) determined 77%

of victims were previously physically intimate with their stalker, 18% engaged in an emotionally intimate relationship with the stalker, 12% reported they were in a committed dating relationship with their perpetrator, and 3% identified their pursuer as a friend. Findings from the largest sample of college students by Fisher et al. (2002) indicate 80% of stalking victims knew or had seen their stalker before the intrusive behaviors began whereas 18% report their stalker was a stranger. Of those 80% who knew their stalker, 43% were stalked by an ex-partner, 35% were stalked by a classmate or acquaintance, and 10% were pursued by a friend (Fisher et al., 2002).

The previous research on college student stalking victimization and perpetration provides valuable insight to an otherwise unexplored phenomenon; however, they do not exist without limitations. Methodological issues arise when researchers do not provide respondents with a clear definition of stalking. For example, McCreedy and Dennis (1996, pp.76) allow their subjects to interpret the meaning of 'stalking' by asking, "Have you ever been stalked by someone (known or unknown) whom you thought might do you physical harm?" Similarly, Philips et al. (2004) do not provide respondents with a clear definition of stalking before asking respondents if they have ever been victimized by stalking. Another methodological limitation of several studies that explore stalking among college students is the categorization of stalking as exhibiting only one intrusive behavior. As discussed earlier, considering only one intrusive behavior as stalking creates definitional issues. According to the requirements of all state stalking statutes, the intrusive and harassing behavior must be committed *repeatedly*. Therefore, any intrusive or harassing behavior experienced only once should not be considered stalking, according to legal definitions. Davis et al. (2000) classify their college sample of stalking

perpetrators into two groups: students who have perpetrated one to five acts of stalking behaviors and students who have perpetrated between six and twenty-three acts.

Although grouping perpetrators based on the number of intrusive behaviors is an interesting and beneficial approach to determine differences between mild and severe stalking perpetrators, the analysis should only examine those perpetrators who report two or more intrusive behaviors. Similarly, Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. (2000) and Sinclair and Frieze (2000) include students in their analysis of perpetrators who indicate committing only one unwanted pursuit behavior. Legal definitions and the widely accepted research definition of stalking do not include individuals who report only committing one intrusive behavior.¹

Overall, prior research among college students reveals stalking victims most often experience unwanted and repeated telephone calls from their stalkers. Prior research also indicates victims often know their stalkers well and they are frequently friends or intimate partners with their stalkers.

Factors that Predict Stalking Victimization and Perpetration

A number of studies have examined the influence of specific risk factors on stalking victimization and perpetration. This line of research is increasing and has only begun to explore the possibility that there are common characteristics among those who stalk and among those who are stalked. Three studies investigating stalking among college students examined the influence of residing on-campus in comparison to living off-campus on victimization (Fisher et al., 2002; McCreedy & Dennis, 1996; Mustaine &

¹ Most research adopts a general definition of stalking very similar to that of the NVAWS, which includes repetitive intrusive behaviors that are unwanted, frightening, and threatening to the victim. Refer to Appendix A for a list of potential stalking behaviors.

Tewksbury, 1999). Both Fisher et al. (2002) and Mustaine and Tewksbury (1999) found female students residing off-campus to be at a significantly higher risk than females residing on-campus for stalking victimization. Similarly, McCreedy and Dennis (1996) report that the majority of stalking victims live off-campus (85%) and are women (85%). A higher level of guardianship often provided by on-campus residences could potentially explain the increased risk of victimization living off-campus for college students. Mustaine and Tewksbury (1999) describe on-campus housing as a potentially safer environment than off-campus residences due to security guards, resident assistants, and residents who are knowledgeable of who belongs and does not belong in the dormitory. Fisher et al. (2002) further attribute an increased risk of stalking victimization to students who reside off-campus to the fact that virtually all on-campus housing requires dual or multiple occupancy, thereby providing on-campus residents with a 'safety in numbers' type of guardianship. This means on-campus residents are most likely required to reside with one or more individuals, or protectors, whereas students living off-campus are permitted to dwell alone.

In addition to the location of residence, current relationship status has also been empirically linked to a heightened risk of stalking victimization. Fisher et al. (2002) discovered college students who are seriously or occasionally dating are more likely to become a victim of stalking. This unique discovery may be explained by the finding that many victims are stalked by previous or current intimate partners or by the finding that individuals who are exposed to more people and social situations are more likely to be victimized (Fisher et al., 2002). Therefore, college students who are actively dating may expose themselves to an increased number of potential offenders. Based on prior

research, it can be expected that respondents who are currently dating will have a higher likelihood of stalking victimization and perpetration. Inquiring of current dating status identifies people who date and, therefore, who may be more likely to experience stalking.

Prior research examining the impact of race on stalking victimization and perpetration are rare and findings have been mixed (Melton, 2000). McCreedy and Dennis (1996) reported that 85% of their sample of stalking victims was White whereas Meloy and Gothard (1995) found only 35% of their sample of stalking victims to be White. Bjerregaard (2000) found stalking perpetrators to be mostly White (67% of perpetrators who stalk females and 81% of perpetrators who stalk males were White). Mustaine and Tewksbury (1999) found that race was not a statistically significant predictive factor for stalking victimization while Fisher et al. (2002) determined Hispanics, Asians and Pacific Islanders were significantly less likely to be victimized than Whites while Native Americans and Alaskan Natives were significantly more likely to be victimized than Whites. In light of these conflicting findings, it is clear more attention must be focused on the impact of race on stalking victimization and perpetration.

A few studies have investigated the relationship between drug and alcohol use and the increased risk of stalking victimization or perpetration. Mustaine and Tewksbury (1999) discovered college females who engage in drinking and drug use behaviors are at an increased risk for stalking victimization. Similarly, Logan et al. (2000) suggest that alcohol use significantly increases the likelihood of perpetrating stalking behaviors. It appears that substance use increases the risk of both stalking perpetration and stalking victimization.

Prior research has linked sexually risky activity to stalking victimization. Haugaard and Seri (2001, 2003, 2004) report interesting, yet contradicting findings among three publications. Their first study reveals a statistically significant finding that stalking victims report less sexual activity during high school and college than non-victims (Haugaard & Seri, 2001). Alternatively, these researchers later find stalking victims report more sexual activity during high school and college than non-victims (Haugaard & Seri, 2003). Stalking victims from this study were also more likely to have engaged in sexual activity at an earlier age than non-victims (Haugaard & Seri, 2003). Later, these researchers find no significant differences between victims and non-victims of stalking and sexual risk taking (which included age and frequency of sexual intercourse) (Haugaard & Seri, 2004). Surprisingly, the authors do not mention any of the sexual risk taking findings from their prior work. It is unclear as to why such research would yield such staggeringly different findings because all three publications include the same stalking measures and two of the publications (Haugaard & Seri, 2003, 2004) examined the same sample of 631 college students. Within the two publications using the same sample of 631 college students, both analyses use ANOVAs to test the impact of sexual risk taking on stalking. These remarkable and opposing findings warrant further examination of the impact sexual risk taking has on stalking.

Gender has been a common factor examined in prior stalking research. McCreedy and Dennis (1996) report that the majority of stalking victims are women (84.8%). On the other hand, Cupach and Spitzberg (2000) reported that males and females were equally likely to report obsessional relational intrusion behaviors. Although some studies of college students indicate males are often perpetrators and females are typically victims

(Bjerregaard, 2000; Logan et al., 2000), other research reveals no gender difference for reported stalking perpetration (Dye & Davis, 2003; Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2000). This finding would mean that males are statistically no more or less likely than females to be stalkers. Interestingly, a finding of no gender differences for stalking perpetration indicates that females report committing a substantial amount of unwanted, repeated, and harassing behaviors, which violates the traditional view of females as victims and males as perpetrators.

Attitudes toward women have never before been tested as a factor predictive of stalking perpetration or victimization. Because this link has not yet been studied, there is a clear need to investigate the relationship between attitudes toward women and stalking. This exploratory research may yield significant findings and should not be discounted as a possible stalking risk factor. Prior research also indicates investigating attitudes toward women should be one of the next steps within the stalking literature (White et al., 2000).

In sum, perceptions of stalking have evolved since the first stalking legislation was passed in 1990. Although celebrity cases of stalking first introduced the crime to the public, researchers, lawmakers, and the community have since recognized that this crime affects a wide range of individuals. With varying stalking laws and definitions, identifying stalking behavior can prove to be more difficult than identifying many other types of crime. Although no one clear definition of stalking exists within the literature, researchers seem to have reached a consensus about the basic elements required for stalking such as intrusive, unwanted, repeated, and frightening or harassing behavior. Similarly, the current study follows suit and considers stalking as identical to the definition outlined by the NVAWS, which includes repetitive intrusive behaviors that are

unwanted, frightening, and threatening to the victim (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). Using this definition of stalking, the current study attempts to replicate and build upon prior research that investigates predictive factors of stalking. Prior research reveals younger people are victimized by stalking at a higher rate than those who are older (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998) and that between 6% and 27% of college students are victims of stalking (Logan et al., 2000; McCreedy & Dennis, 1996). Prior research also shows that between 1% and 8% of college students are perpetrators of stalking (Fremouw et al., 1997; Haugaard & Seri, 2003). In addition to examining factors found by prior research to be related to stalking victimization and perpetration, the current study also investigates the link between stalking and theoretical factors.

CHAPTER 3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The previous literature on theoretical explanations of stalking is severely limited, but can, in part, be attributed to the fact that stalking research is somewhat still developing. As a result, stalking literature is still exploratory and descriptive and has not yet involved many theoretical advancements. The only two theoretical perspectives applied to the occurrence of stalking have been routine activities theory and attachment theory. Although the current study does not test routine activities theory or attachment theory, a review of prior research is provided. Following a review of routine activities theory and attachment theory is an overview of applications of the general theory of crime. Finally, an explanation of the current study's test of the general theory of crime will follow.

Cohen and Felson (1979) developed routine activities theory, which introduced a unique way in which to study criminal activity. Routine activities theory does not focus on the characteristics of the criminal but rather centers on circumstances of the crime itself. The three elements of routine activities theory include the existence of motivated offenders (criminals), suitable targets (victim or object), and the lack of capable guardians (such as individuals, rules, or preventative objects). The absence of one of these three elements may drastically reduce the likelihood of criminal behavior whereas the combination of all three elements in the same time and space is likely to significantly increase the likelihood of crime (Cohen & Felson, 1979).

Two studies have applied routine activities theory to the explanation of stalking victimization (Fisher et al., 2002; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1999). Both studies tested the theoretical approach using large samples of female college students (N = 4,446; N = 861, respectively). Fisher et al. (2002) argue female college students are at an increased proximity to motivated offenders due to their status as a student, since they are frequently in situations that expose them to many social situations and, therefore, to potential perpetrators. Further, this study claims full-time female college students are at an even higher risk of stalking victimization than part-time students due to the increased amount of time exposed to the college campus and potential perpetrators. Female college students may also be more likely than female non-college students to attend social events that expose them to large proportions of males, such as fraternity, house, or dormitory parties located in male residences (Fisher et al., 2002). In addition to the respondents' current enrollment status (part-time versus full-time), proximity to motivated offenders was also measured by the sex of the respondents' roommates. This variable was designed to indicate the increased risk of stalking victimization if respondents reside closely with males. The location of the respondent's residence (either on- or off-campus) was used to determine proximity to motivated offenders in addition to a scale measuring tendencies to be in places where males are exclusively located.

Prior research states that stalking perpetrators are often males and stalking victims are often females (Fisher et al., 2002; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998; Tjaden, Thoennes, & Allison, 2000; White et al., 2000). Fisher et al. (2002), therefore, suggests that female college students are exposed to males more often than non-students due to the inevitable proximity to males in classrooms and dormitories. Fisher et al. (2002) incorporate

several measures of the suitable target element for testing routine activities theory, which includes the frequency that the respondent uses drugs and alcohol and the respondent's current relationship status. In this study, suitable targets of stalking victimization are college women who place themselves at an increased risk by frequently consuming drugs and/or alcohol, and by being in a dating relationship. The presence of capable guardians was measured by examining the location of respondent's residence (living alone versus with others).

Fisher et al. (2002) found overall support for routine activities theory. Consistent with routine activities theory, stalking victimization was dependent upon the victim's lifestyle. College women who were more likely to be victimized were also more likely to live alone (suitable target), to patronize establishments that served alcohol, and to be involved in a dating relationship (proximity to motivated offenders) (Fisher et al., 2002).

Mustaine and Tewksbury (1999) also conducted a study that tested the application of routine activities to female college student stalking victimization. This study measured several lifestyle activities of respondents and reported that the variables predictive of stalking victimization were indicators of being suitable targets, such as buying drugs, drinking to excess in public, shopping frequently, and being employed. Each of these behaviors ranged from illegal and dangerous to legal and ordinary, although all significantly predicted an increased chance of being a staking victim. Capable guardians were considered nonexistent off-campus and, therefore, Mustaine and Tewksbury (1999) use this measure (live on-campus versus off-campus) to determine the presence of capable guardians. These researchers assume motivated offenders naturally exist within society and a variable for this element of the theory is not used.

Mustaine and Tewksbury (1999) find overall support for routine activities theory. In other words, college women who reside off-campus, who engage in risky substance use (drugs and alcohol), and who regularly place themselves in social situations (such as frequenting the mall or being at work) are significantly more likely to be victimized by stalking.

In addition to the studies that apply routine activities theory to stalking victimization, attachment theory has been used to explain the perpetration of stalking. Attachment theory has its roots in the discipline of psychology and states that children develop an early bond with caregivers and the quality of the bond remains relatively stable throughout the life span (Ainsworth, 1989; Bowlby, 1969). Attachment theory describes secure attachment, insecure-avoidant attachment, and insecure-ambivalent attachment (Ainsworth, 1989). Whereas attachment theory initially characterized the bond developed by children to their caregivers, Hazan and Shaver (1987) apply attachment theory to explain attachment among dating partners. This application of attachment theory would suggest that bonds developed during childhood not only predict the types of bonds to those same parental figures during adulthood, but also characterize the type of bond experienced during adult intimate partner relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1987).

Taken a step further, attachment theory may account for stalking behavior (Kienlen, 1998). More specifically, Kienlen (1998) states that individuals who develop insecure attachments with caregivers may be more likely to develop a pattern of preoccupied attachment in adulthood and in dating relationships, leading to stalking perpetration. To test this hypothesis, criminal stalkers were questioned about early

childhood experiences including the presence of divorce, a sudden change or loss of a caregiver, and child abuse. Findings overwhelmingly indicated stalkers in the sample were exposed to troubling childhood experiences with their caregivers. Sixty-three percent of stalkers experienced a sudden change in caregiver and 55% reported being victimized by child abuse (Kienlen, Birmingham, Solberg, O'Regan, & Meloy, 1997). Therefore, Kienlen et al. (1997) suggest that a relationship exists between troubling childhood experiences and the existence of insecure attachments with caregivers and the perpetration of stalking behaviors.

The current study does not test routine activities theory or attachment theory due to a lack of applicable variables needed to sufficiently test each theoretical approach. In terms of routine activities theory measures of suitable targets, the current study did not inquire about the level of social interaction/exposure or current enrollment status (part-time/full-time) of the respondents. Furthermore, motivated offenders could not be adequately identified. Finally, the presence or absence of capable guardians could not be assessed accurately by asking only if respondents reside on or off-campus because off-campus housing may include living with parents, roommates, or family members who could serve as capable guardians. In terms of attachment theory measures, the current study did not inquire about respondents' level and quality of attachment to caregivers during early childhood, which would be necessary to link childhood attachment to adulthood attachment.

Theoretical contributions to the stalking literature are extremely undeveloped and have been limited to routine activities theory and attachment theory. Furthermore, tests of routine activities theory have been limited to samples of female college student victims

and applications of attachment theory have been primarily restricted to legally identified samples of stalking perpetrators. There is a critical need for the application of additional theoretical approaches to the study of stalking victimization and perpetration.

Among many other theories, Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) general theory of crime has never been used to explain the phenomenon of stalking. Several recent research articles within the stalking literature express a strong need for future research to investigate the extent to which low self-control predicts stalking (Rosenfeld, 2004; White et al., 2000). Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) theory identifies several elements of self-control and suggests that individuals with low self-control prefer a simple and immediate fulfillment of desires, seek few long-term benefits, and engage in behaviors that are exciting and risky. According to a general theory of crime, individuals develop self-control during childhood and one's level of self-control remains relatively stable over the life course (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). Turner and Piquero (2002) also provide evidence that levels of self-control are in a state of fluctuation during childhood but remain relatively constant in adulthood. The general theory of crime further states that when an opportunity to commit crime presents itself, individuals with low self-control are more likely to engage in criminal behavior than people with high self-control. Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990, pp. 111) identify self-control as "the only enduring personal characteristic predictive of criminal (and related) behavior."

As a result of Gottfredson and Hirschi's innovative and compelling emphasis on the importance of self-control, scores of researchers have empirically tested the theory's capability of predicting a variety of criminal behaviors. The General Theory of Crime has been quite popular and controversial over the past decade, resulting in Gottfredson

and Hirschi as two of the top three researchers most commonly cited in academic journals between 1991 and 1995 (Cohn & Farrington, 1998). As a general theory of crime, this theoretical perspective has been applied to a wide variety of crimes and criminal behavior. Many studies have investigated how low self-control impacts the perpetration of crime and analogous behaviors (such as smoking, gambling, and excessive alcohol use) and has found theoretical support (Baron, 2003; Evans, Cullen, Burton, Dunaway, & Benson, 1997; Wright, Caspi, Moffitt, & Silva, 1999), while other empirical studies have failed to find support for self-control theory (Patternoster & Brame, 2000). Piquero, MacDonald, Dobrin, Daigle, & Cullen (2005) found overall support for self-control theory as well as other risk factors on violent offending and homicide victimization.

Self-control theory has also been empirically tested and successfully supported among studies investigating perceived sanction fairness (Piquero, Gomez-Smith, & Langton, 2005), intimate partner aggressiveness (Sellers, 1999), the degree of monetary gain by criminal offenders (Morcelli & Tremblay, 2004), and parenting effects on children's low self-control (Hay, 2001). Partial theoretical support has been found in many studies investigating gender differences in adolescent delinquency (LaGrange & Silverman, 1999), age, gender variations in criminal behavior (Tittle, Ward, & Grasmick, 2003), and juvenile offending (Longshore, Chang, & Messina, 2005). Turner and Piquero (2002) also found offender's levels of self-control to be significantly lower than the levels of self-control for non-offenders.

However, Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) general theory of crime has also been subjected to theoretical critiques with studies revealing no support for self-control (Akers, 1991). Wright and Beaver (2005) did not find support for self-control theory for

parenting effects on children's low self-control. Simpson and Piquero (2002) also found no support for low self-control among corporate offenders. Forde and Kennedy (1997) find that self-control does not directly affect criminal behavior, although self-control factors did affect related, although not criminal, behaviors (such as drinking, smoking, and gambling), which are often associated with crime.

Grasmick, Tittle, Bursik, and Arneklev (1993) designed a survey measurement of low self-control, which was directly modeled by elements of self-control in Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) general theory of crime. Grasmick et al. (1993) created, tested, and found support for their low self-control scale's ability to predict criminal offending. Piquero, MacIntosh, and Hickman (2000) retested the validity of Grasmick et al.'s (1993) self-control scale and confirmed its effectiveness and value in assessing respondents' low self-control. Numerous other researchers have successfully utilized Grasmick et al.'s (1993) popular self-control scale (Sellers, 1999; Tittle et al., 2003).

Self-control theory typically applies to the perpetration of criminal behaviors. Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) designed their general theory of crime to explain a predictive characteristic (low self-control) for criminal offending. The vast majority of subsequent research has also focused on self-control theory's ability to predict the perpetration of crime. However, recent applications of self-control theory have begun to shift focus from perpetrator's low self-control to that of victim's low self-control. Schreck (1999) pioneered the investigation of low self-control and criminal victimization and found that low self-control is a risk factor for victimization, even after risky lifestyle behaviors were controlled. Schreck (1999) further tests the versatility of applying self-control to different types of criminal victimization and findings indicate measures of low

self-control can successfully be used as predictors of victimization for a variety of crimes. Similarly, Steward, Elifson, and Sterk (2004) found that low self-control is a risk factor for victimization, after also controlling for risky lifestyle behaviors. This line of research introduces an entirely distinct and virtually unexplored perspective to Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) general theory of crime. In addition to the application of the general theory of crime to victimization research, the more specific application to stalking victimization has never been investigated to date.

Although the general theory of crime has been subjected to unsupportive critiques, many researchers have discovered empirical support in favor of the theory. It appears as if findings of mixed support are most common within the literature testing the general theory of crime. Many more types of criminal perpetration and victimization warrant further tests of self-control theory.

Self-control has not been used to explain stalking victimization or perpetration. Because the use of theoretical applications to explain stalking has been limited, the use of self-control theory to explain stalking would contribute important theoretical findings. Stalking perpetrators may have lower self-control than non-perpetrators, which may help explain their propensity to give in to their desire to stalk. As described earlier, prior stalking research has discovered a previous relationship exists between the victim and the perpetrator in some cases of stalking (Brewster, 2000; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). Because many victims and perpetrators are friends or intimate partners prior to the stalking behavior, victims and perpetrators may have similar characteristics that bond them in friendship or romance. Other research has shown victims and perpetrators of crime often come from the same social networks (Gottfredson, 1987; Sampson &

Lauritsen, 1990). Sampson and Lauritsen (1990) find that offenders of crime are at a significantly higher risk of becoming a victim of crime. It appears as if victims of crime are often perpetrators of crime. Therefore, because victims of stalking often associate themselves with stalking perpetrators, victims may also show evidence of lower levels of self-control that stalking perpetrators exhibit.

Overall, theoretical tests have not been plentiful within the stalking literature. Only routine activities theory and attachment theory have been tested and found to provide an explanation of stalking victimization and perpetration. The current study is the first application of Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) general theory of crime to college student stalking perpetration and victimization. It is anticipated that stalking perpetrators will exhibit lower levels of self-control than non-perpetrators. Similarly, because stalking victims and perpetrators are often associated prior to the offense, it is anticipated that victims of stalking will also report lower levels of self-control than non-victims.

CHAPTER 4 METHODOLOGY

Procedure

For purposes of this study and subsequent research projects, an extensive survey was created entitled “Family and Relationship Experiences and Attitudes among College Students” (Fox, Robson, Gover, & Kaukinen, November 2005). This survey consists of 167 questions regarding topics such as stalking victimization and perpetration, family of origin violence, dating violence victimization and perpetration, fear of crime, protective and risk factors, attitudes toward women, risk-taking behaviors, and various demographic questions. The survey was constructed specifically for college student samples and includes previously validated scales and indexes such as the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale II (CTS2) (Straus & Hamby, 1995), Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS) (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1973), Grasmick et al. (1993) low self-control scale, and scales from the National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS) (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998).

After receiving Institutional Review Board approval, the survey was administered to college students at the University of Florida between August 2005 and December 2005. Permission was obtained from faculty teaching liberal arts and sciences courses to administer surveys during class meetings. After receiving informed consent forms the purpose of the research was explained to students. Students did not receive any rewards for their participation in the research. Due to the personal and sensitive nature of the survey questions, respondents were assured confidentiality in several ways. Participants

were instructed not to provide researchers with any identifying information (such as name, student identification number, etc.) and were also given large envelopes for purposes of concealing responses upon survey completion.

Research Questions

The current study aims to answer four research questions, including: (1) What factors predict stalking victimization among college students? (2) Are stalking victimization predictors invariant across gender? (3) What factors predict stalking perpetration among college students? (4) Are stalking perpetration predictors invariant across gender?

Dependent Variables

The two dependent variables for this analysis are (1) stalking victimization and (2) stalking perpetration. The beginning of the stalking victimization and perpetration sections of the survey included similar survey instructions used in the National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS):

The following section asks you about **frightening or harassing things** someone may have done to you. Not including bill collectors, telephone solicitors, or other sales people, please indicate if anyone, male or female, has ever done any of these things to you. You may have experienced the following behaviors from strangers, former boyfriends/girlfriends, or acquaintances.

Respondents were asked a series of questions about specific stalking victimization behaviors such as: “Has anyone ever followed, watched or spied on you?” “Has anyone ever stood outside your home, school, or workplace?” and “Has anyone ever sent unsolicited letters, written correspondence, or unwanted emails?” (See survey in Appendix B for the list of survey stalking behaviors). Because stalking is comprised of unwanted and repeated behavior, respondents were then asked a crucial question: “Has anyone ever done these things to you on more than one occasion?” Stalking

victimization (VICSTALK) is determined using this single indicator inquiring if the stalking behaviors occurred twice or more. Stalking victimization was coded as a dichotomous variable with '1' indicating 'Yes,' meaning victimization occurred and '0' indicating 'No,' meaning no stalking victimization. A response of '1' indicates repeated stalking victimization.¹

Stalking perpetration behaviors were identical to victimization items while only reversing the order of behavior initiation so directions inquired of the respondents if they had personally initiated or engaged in any of the stalking behaviors against another person. Example indicators include: "Have you ever showed up at places you had no business being?" "Have you ever made unsolicited phone calls to someone?" and "Have you ever vandalized someone's property or destroyed something they loved?" (See survey in Appendix B for the list of survey stalking behaviors). Similar to that of stalking victimization, analyses were also limited to respondents who indicated perpetrating stalking behaviors on more than one occasion. Stalking perpetration (PERSTALK) is measured using this single indicator "Have you ever done these things to anyone on more than one occasion?" This dichotomous variable included response options of '1' indicating 'Yes,' meaning perpetration occurred and '0' indicating 'No,' meaning no stalking perpetration. A response of '1' indicates repeated stalking perpetration.

Variation among measures of stalking perpetration and victimization is unknown due to the way in which the survey questioned respondents. For example, categorizing respondents into groups of high/low victims or stalkers is not possible because the survey

¹ Virtually all stalking definitions (among state and federal legislation and empirical research) require the stalking behavior occurs repeatedly (twice or more) before officially classifying the behaviors as stalking.

did not measure variation in the number of times a respondent was victimized or perpetrated stalking. The survey also did not examine variation in behaviors experienced in a single incident. Respondents indicating stalking behaviors occurred more than once were not asked how many times behaviors occurred. Although respondents were given the opportunity to indicate which of the nine stalking behaviors they had experienced, this measure cannot determine if they experienced each once (indicating a low-victim category) or experienced each behavior a dozen times (indicating a high-victim category). Due to the undetermined variation among the variables, stalking perpetration and victimization were both dichotomized such that respondents are classified as victims or non-victims and perpetrators or non-perpetrators.

Independent Variables

Based on a review of prior literature, eleven independent variables are included in this analysis. Five variables represent scales and summated indices specifically for the current research. Listwise deletion was employed to trim out cases with missing values on the outcomes and explanatory variables. Valid sample sizes ranged between 1,365 and 1,420, depending on the outcome (exact sample sizes are shown in the table notes). The analysis used a single indicator to determine respondents' current residence status (OFFCAMP) and consisted of the question "Where do you live?" The two response options provided were on-campus and off-campus. This dichotomous variable was coded as '1' for off-campus residence and '0' for on-campus residence.²

² The 'OFFCAMP' measure does not differentiate between people living at home with their family of origin or in an apartment-style residence. This variable, is unable to distinguish between students who live off-campus due to higher socioeconomic status or due to higher class standing status, as some students are likely to move off-campus as they age.

A single question was used to measure respondents' current relationship status: "What is your current relational status?" Response options included the following: 'not currently dating,' 'occasionally dating,' 'steady/exclusively dating,' 'engaged,' 'married,' 'divorced,' and 'other'. The 'ANYDATE' variable seeks to categorize respondents who indicated they are currently dating. Therefore, responses of 'occasionally dating,' 'steady/exclusively dating,' and 'engaged,' were coded as '1' indicating involvement in a dating relationship and responses of 'not currently dating,' 'married,' 'divorced,' and 'other' were coded as '0' indicating not in a dating relationship.³

Respondents' race was also measured using a single indicator. The question "What is your race" was asked of all participants and response options included 'White, non-Hispanic,' 'White, Hispanic,' 'Black or African American,' 'Asian,' 'Pacific Islander,' 'American Indian or Alaskan Native,' and 'Other.' The variable 'WHITE' was created and dichotomized so that the 'White, non-Hispanic' was coded as '1' and all other races were coded as '0.'

A variable for child abuse included eight indicators and was derived from questions from the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale II (CTS) (Straus & Hamby, 1995). The CTS is the most extensively used measure of child abuse (Caliso & Milner, 1992; Messman-Moore & Long, 2000; O'Keefe, 1994). Respondents were asked questions such as "When you were a child did any parent, stepparent, or guardian ever choke or attempt to

³ As mentioned earlier, prior research has found differences in stalking victimization and perpetration rates among individuals in dating versus non-dating relationships (Fisher et al., 2002). The 'ANYDATE' variable is mutually exclusive and classifies married and divorced relational statuses as '0.' This allows for the 'ANYDATE' variable to identify individuals in a current dating relationship for purposes of determining if being in a dating relationship is a risk factor for stalking perpetration or victimization. Only 1.1% of the current sample reported being either married or divorced. Because prior research focuses on dating relationships and because the number of married or divorce respondents is so small, respondents who are married or divorced are classified into the 'not dating' group.

drown you?” “When you were a child did any parent, stepparent, or guardian ever beat you up?” and “When you were a child did any parent, stepparent, or guardian ever hit you so hard that it left bruises or marks?” Response options for each of these eight questions were ‘yes’ (coded as ‘1’) and ‘no’ (coded as ‘0’). Responses to these eight questions were used to create a scale entitled ‘CH_AB2,’ which was recoded and dichotomized such that a score of ‘1’ indicates one or more experiences with child abuse and a score of ‘0’ indicates no experience with child abuse. A response of ‘yes’ to any scale item received a scale score of ‘1,’ indicating experience with at least one type of child abuse. A response of ‘no’ to all items received a scale score of ‘0,’ indicating no child abuse. The range is 0-1 and scale reliability is .73.

Another aspect of exposure to violence within the family of origin was witnessing violence between parents. Witnessing parental abuse was composed of two items. Respondents were asked, “When you were a child, did you ever see your mother hit your father?” and “When you were a child, did you ever see your father hit your mother?” Response options were ‘yes’ (coded as ‘1’) and ‘no’ (coded as ‘0’). Respondents indicating witnessing parental abuse for one or both questions were coded as ‘1’ and respondents reporting never witnessing parental abuse were scored as ‘0.’ This variable was labeled as ‘WITNESS2,’ has a range of 0-1, and has a scale reliability of .57.

Alcohol use was measured with a single item that asked respondents: “In the past year did you drink alcohol?” Response options were ‘never,’ ‘once,’ ‘a few times,’ and ‘often.’ Because 46% of respondents report drinking alcohol ‘often’ within the past year, this variable was dichotomized such that ‘never,’ ‘once,’ and ‘a few times,’ are coded as ‘0’ and a response of ‘often’ is coded as ‘1.’ This variable was labeled as ‘ALCOHOL.’

Marijuana use was measured with a single item. Respondents were asked, “In the past year did you use marijuana?” Response options were ‘never,’ ‘once,’ ‘a few times,’ and ‘often.’ A frequency of this variable indicated that 68% of respondents report never using marijuana within the past year, which indicated a natural break and, therefore, responses were dichotomized so that ‘never’ is coded as ‘0’ and a response of ‘once,’ ‘a few times,’ or ‘often’ is coded as ‘1.’ This variable was labeled as ‘POT.’

Respondents’ sex is measured by a single question, “What is your sex?” and response options include only ‘male’ and ‘female.’ This variable was labeled as ‘MALE’ and coded such that ‘1’ represents male and ‘0’ represents female.

The attitudes toward women measure is comprised of thirteen indicators derived from the revised Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS) (Spence & Hahn, 1997). The AWS has been used since the 1970s to measure attitudes toward women (Etaugh & Spandikow, 1981; Parrott & Zeichner, 2003; Sherman & Spence, 1997). Questions include statements such as, “Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers,” “A woman should not expect to go to exactly the same places or to have quite the same freedom of action as a man,” and “The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men.” Response options include ‘strongly agree,’ ‘agree,’ ‘disagree,’ and ‘strongly disagree.’ For questions C2, C3, C4, C6, C7, and C13 a response of ‘strongly agree’ was coded as ‘1,’ ‘agree’ was coded as ‘2,’ ‘disagree’ was coded as ‘3,’ and ‘strongly disagree’ was coded as ‘4.’ Other questions were reversed coded (questions C1, C5, and C8 through C12) such that ‘strongly agree’ was coded as ‘4,’ ‘agree’ was coded as ‘3,’ ‘disagree’ was coded as ‘2,’ and ‘strongly disagree’ was coded as ‘1.’ The thirteen attitudes toward women items

were combined into a summated index entitled 'ATTWOMEN.' Scale reliability is .81. Scale scores ranged from 2 to 38 whereas a higher scale score indicates a more traditional attitude toward women and a lower scale score indicates more equal attitudes toward women.

The self-control measure is comprised of twenty-three indicators from Grasmick et al.'s (1993) low self-control scale.⁴ This scale is commonly used to measure levels of self-control (Baron, 2003; Piquero et al., 2004; Pratt & Cullen, 2000). Participants responded to statements such as, "I often act on the spur of the moment without stopping to think," "I sometimes find it exciting to do things for which I might get in trouble," and "I lose my temper pretty easily." Responses are coded such that 'strongly agree' is coded as '1,' 'agree' is coded as '2,' 'disagree' is coded as '3,' and 'strongly disagree' is coded as '4.' The self-control items were combined into a scale in which the mean was calculated and entitled 'SLFCONT2.' Scale reliability is .86. Response options were summed to attain a total scale score and divided by total items (23) so overall scale scores ranged from 1 to 4, such that lower scale scores indicate lower levels of self-control.

A sexual risk taking index was created from two indicators. Respondents were asked "How old were you when you had sexual intercourse for the first time?" and "During your life, how many people have you had sexual intercourse with?" Response options for the first question included seven response options that corresponded to age selections and included: 'I have never had sexual intercourse' (coded as '0'), 'eighteen or

⁴ The original self-control scale created by Grasmick et al. (1993) included twenty-four indicators. The revised scale used in the present study includes twenty-three of the original indicators and omits one question that states, 'I seem to have more energy and a greater need for activity than most other people my age.' The current research followed prior research (Baron, 2003; Forde & Kennedy, 1997; Hay, 2001) and uses Grasmick et al.'s (1993) scale with only twenty-three of the twenty-four item scale.

older' (coded as '1'), 'seventeen' (coded as '2'), 'sixteen' (coded as '3'), 'fifteen' (coded as '4'), 'fourteen' (coded as '5'), and 'thirteen or younger' (coded as '6'). Similarly, response options for the second question included: 'I have never had sexual intercourse' (coded as '0'), '1 partner' (coded as '1'), '2 partners' (coded as '2'), '3 partners' (coded as '3'), '4 partners' (coded as '4'), '5 partners' (coded as '5'), and '6 partners or more' (coded as '6'). The two questions were summed and coded as a sexual risk taking index (SEXRISK) and have a scale reliability of .81. Scale scores ranged from 0 to 12 whereas a higher scale score indicates a higher level of sexual risk taking (meaning younger age at first sexual intercourse and a higher number of total sexual partners).

Analytic Plan

Bivariate correlations were used to determine how variables are related in terms of multicollinearity. Several statistical models were estimated in order to explore relationships between the dependent variables, stalking perpetration and victimization, and eleven independent variables. Separate analyses will be conducted for stalking victimization and stalking perpetration. Logistic regressions will be used because both dependent variables are dichotomous and because this study aims to predict the presence of characteristics based on values of a set of predictor variables. Odds ratios will be used to predict the probability for which participants are either stalking victims or perpetrators.

Logit regression models for stalking victimization and perpetration will be estimated for the full sample. If gender has a significant influence on stalking perpetration or victimization in the full sample models, the data will be split so that male and female models can be estimated separately. The six models would include three for victimization (full model, female model, and male model) and three for perpetration (full model, female model, and male model). If the full model for either dependent variable

does not reveal gender differences, separate models of males and females will not be estimated.

CHAPTER 5 RESULTS

Overall Sample Description

The sample includes 1,490 students and the overall response rate for the survey was 98% (see Table 5-1 below for frequencies and means of variables).¹ Of the 1,490 respondents, 65% were female and 35% were male. The unequal gender distribution of the sample reflects the unique gender composition in liberal arts and science courses because there is a higher proportion of women than men seeking liberal arts and sciences degrees. The majority of the sample was White (64.2%), which is representative of the university's student population. Fourteen percent of the sample are Hispanic, 13% African American, 5.3% Asian, .8 % Pacific Islander, .2% American Indian or Alaskan Native, and 2.1% Other. The majority (62%) of students live off-campus and 59% of respondents reported to be occasionally dating, exclusively dating, or engaged. The respondents are relatively young as 35% of the sample is eighteen, 25% is nineteen, 19% is twenty, and 22% is twenty-one or older. The average age of respondents is 19 years old. Class standing closely mirrors age with 36% freshmen, 22% sophomores, 24% juniors, and 18% seniors.

Approximately 29% of respondents indicated that they experienced childhood abuse and 11% of respondents reported witnessing violence between parents during

¹ The response rate was calculated by comparing the total number of completed surveys to the number of students present during class on the day surveys were administered. The total number of students present during survey administrations was 1,534 and a total of 44 students declined to participate, resulting in a 98% response rate.

childhood. Almost half of respondents indicated using alcohol during the past year (46%). Fewer students reported using marijuana in the past year (33%). Respondents' average scale score for sexual risk taking was 3.3 (Range = 0-12), the average attitudes toward women scale score was 23 (Range = 2-38), and the average low self-control scale score was 2.92 (Range = 1-4).

Table 5-1. Descriptive Statistics of Variables (Full Sample; N=1,490)

<i>Variables</i>	Frequency (N)	(SD)	Range
<i>Independent Measures</i>			
Male	34.6% (515)	—	0-1
Freshman	35.9% (535)	—	0-1
Sophomore	22% (328)	—	0-1
Junior	24% (358)	—	0-1
Senior	18.1% (269)	—	0-1
White	64.2% (957)	—	0-1
Hispanic	13.8% (205)	—	0-1
African American	13% (194)	—	0-1
Asian	5.3% (79)	—	0-1
Pacific Islander	.8% (12)	—	0-1
American Indian/Alaskan Native	.2% (3)	—	0-1
Race—Other	2.1% (32)	—	0-1
Live Off-Campus	61.5% (916)	—	0-1
Dating Status	58.5% (871)	—	0-1
Childhood Victimization	28.9% (430)	—	0-1
Witness Parental Abuse	11.3% (169)	—	0-1
Alcohol	46% (675)	—	0-1

Table 5-1. Continued.

<i>Variables</i>	Frequency (N)	(SD)	Range
<i>Independent Measures</i>			
Marijuana	32.5% (477)	—	0-1
	Mean	(SD)	Range
Age	2.27	1.15	1-6
Sexual Risk Taking	3.30	3.36	0-12
Attitudes Toward Women	23.49	5.57	2-38
Low Self-Control	2.92	.38	1-4
<i>Dependent Measures</i>			
	Frequency (N)	(SD)	Range
Stalking Victimization	24.8% (347)	—	0-1
Stalking Perpetration	6.9% (100)	—	0-1

Descriptive Analysis

Characteristics of Stalking Victims

Results indicated that 25% of respondents (N = 347) have been victimized by stalking.² The majority of stalking victims (70%) are female (N = 242). Sixty-three percent of stalking victims are White (non-Hispanic), 15% are African American, 14% are Hispanic, 4% Asian, 1% Pacific Islander, .4% American Indian or Alaskan Native, and 2.6% Other. The majority of stalking victims reside off-campus (64.8%) and are in a dating relationship (66%). Respondents were asked to identify their relationship with their stalker at the time of the offense. This question was not mutually exclusive and

² These respondents indicated victimization of stalking according to the NVAWS definition of stalking wherein individuals experienced two or more of the nine frightening or harassing stalking behaviors listed (see survey in Appendix B for the nine stalking indicators).

permitted individuals stalked by more than one person to identify multiple perpetrators. Stalking victims report being stalked by an acquaintance (17%), former intimate dating partner (15%), stranger (12%), friend (8%), and current intimate dating partner (2%). Almost 5% were not sure of the identity of their stalker.

Characteristics of Stalking Perpetrators

Results indicated that 7% (N=100) of the sample report perpetrating stalking behaviors. Over half (58%) of stalking perpetrators are female (N=58). Sixty-one percent of stalking perpetrators are White (non-Hispanic), 11% are African American, 18% are Hispanic, 5% Asian, 1% Pacific Islander, no American Indian or Alaskan Native, and 3% Other. The majority of stalking perpetrators reside off-campus (60%) and are in a dating relationship (58%). Respondents were asked to identify their relationship with their victim at the time of the offense. This question was not mutually exclusive and permitted individuals to identify multiple victims. Stalking perpetrators report stalking either a former intimate dating partner (7%), a friend (7%), acquaintance (3%), current intimate dating partner (3%), and stranger (2%).

Bivariate Relationships

Bivariate correlations were used to assess relationships among variables and to specifically determine if multicollinearity problems were present in these data. Table 5-2 below provides Pearson's correlation coefficients for the dependent variables (stalking victimization and stalking perpetration) and all eleven independent variables. Although determining the point at which multicollinearity exists varies among researchers, many classify values of .6 or higher as levels warranting concern. No evidence of multicollinearity was found among the variables of interest (the highest Pearson correlation value is .431).

Table 5-2. Correlation Matrix (Full Sample; N=1,490)

VARIABLES	Stalking Victim	Stalking Perp	Male	Off-Campus	Anydate	White	Child Abuse	Low Self-Control	Alcohol	Marijuana	Sexual Risk Taking	Witness Abuse	Attitudes toward Women
<i>Stalking Victim</i>	—												
<i>Stalking Perp</i>	.156** p=.000	—											
<i>Male</i>	-.044 p=.098	.046 p=.081	—										
<i>Off-Campus</i>	.034 p=.200	-.010 p=.703	.056* p=.030	—									
<i>Anydate</i>	.089** p=.001	-.003 p=.918	-.052* p=.046	.066* p=.011	—								
<i>White</i>	-.013 p=.615	-.020 p=.435	.036 p=.165	-.004 p=.883	.067** p=.010	—							
<i>Child Abuse</i>	.122** p=.000	-.110** p=.000	.029 p=.260	.002 p=.939	-.013 p=.613	-.226** p=.000	—						
<i>Low Self-Control</i>	-.084** p=.002	-.052* p=.049	-.180** p=.000	-.15 p=.961	-.012 p=.649	.057* p=.028	-.142** p=.000	—					
<i>Alcohol</i>	.069** p=.010	.077** p=.004	.109** p=.000	.143** p=.000	.171** p=.000	.176** p=.000	-.043 p=.099	-.166** p=.000	—				
<i>Marijuana</i>	.065* p=.016	.055* p=.036	.130** p=.000	.144** p=.000	.107** p=.000	.079** p=.000	.001 p=.966	-.164** p=.000	.431** p=.000	—			
<i>Sexual Risk Taking</i>	.120** p=.000	.053* p=.044	.079** p=.002	.192** p=.000	.269** p=.000	-.007 p=.780	.049 p=.064	-.123** p=.000	.346** p=.000	.355** p=.000	—		
<i>Witness Abuse</i>	.092** p=.001	.077** p=.003	.038 p=.140	.005 p=.853	.065* p=.012	-.100** p=.000	.253** p=.000	-.066* p=.012	-.036 p=.166	.018 p=.483	.062* p=.018	—	
<i>Attitudes toward Women</i>	-.043 p=.106	-.007 p=.785	.383** p=.000	.383** p=.000	-.046 p=.076	.036 p=.172	-.034 p=.192	-.229** p=.000	.002 p=.925	.016 p=.533	-.013 p=.626	-.031 p=.236	—

*p<.05 **p<.01

The full sample correlation matrix indicates that several independent variables are significantly associated with both dependent variables (stalking perpetration and victimization). Specifically, experiencing child abuse, reporting low levels of self-control, using alcohol often during the past year, using marijuana in the past year, engaging in sexual risk taking, and witnessing violence between parents are significantly associated with both stalking victimization and perpetration. One additional independent variable, being in a dating relationship, was significantly related to stalking victimization only. All significant Pearson correlations were in the expected directions. Interestingly, the bivariate correlations between gender and stalking perpetration and gender and stalking victimization were not significant. Therefore, these results indicate that predictors of stalking victimization and perpetration may not vary by gender. These results are possibly an initial indication that several of these measures may actually predict stalking perpetration and victimization, but it cannot be determined with certainty if this is the case until multivariate models are estimated that control for the effects of other indicators.

Multivariate Analysis

Table 5-3 below presents the logistic regression results from the full sample model for stalking perpetration. Two independent variables were found to have a significant impact on stalking perpetration. Individuals who experienced child abuse are significantly more likely to perpetrate stalking compared to individuals who did not experience child abuse ($B = .696, p > .01$). In fact, the findings indicate that experiencing childhood abuse increased the odds of stalking perpetration by 100%. In addition, those who report consuming alcohol often were also significantly more likely to report stalking perpetration ($B = .610, p > .05$). Specifically, drinking alcohol often increased the odds

of stalking perpetration by 84%. Stalking perpetration was not significantly influenced by race, self-control, attitudes toward women, residing off-campus, being in a dating relationship, witnessing parental abuse, engaging in sexual risk taking, or using marijuana during the past year. Because gender did not have a significant influence on stalking perpetration in the full sample model, split models were not estimated for stalking perpetration among males and females.

Table 5-3. Logistic Regression Predicting Stalking Perpetration (Full Sample; N = 1,420)

Variable	B	SE	Sig.	EXP (B)
Male	.230	.246	.350	1.258
Offcamp	-.228	.224	.309	.796
Anydate	-.165	.225	.463	.848
White	-.135	.229	.554	.873
Witness Abuse	.505	.289	.080	1.657
Child victimization	.696**	.230	.002	2.005
Self-Control	-.206	.292	.481	.814
Attwomen	-.013	.021	.549	.987
Alcohol	.610*	.252	.016	1.840
Pot	.101	.249	.686	1.106
Sexrisk	.027	.034	.426	1.027

*p<.05 **p<.01

Table 5-4 below presents the results of the logistic regression model for the full sample for stalking victimization. Four variables have a significant influence on victimization: gender, childhood victimization, self-control, and sexual risk taking. Gender had a negative significant influence on victimization, which indicates that males are less likely than females to be victimized ($B = -.304$, $p > .05$). Specifically, being male decreases the odds of stalking victimization by 26%. This finding indicates the need to estimate models separately for males and females to determine if predictors of victimization vary by gender (findings presented in tables 5-5 and 5-6). In addition, child abuse was positively and significantly related to stalking victimization ($B = .442$, $p > .01$). Therefore, respondents who experienced abuse during childhood were more likely to be victims of stalking than respondents who did not experience child abuse.

Experiencing child abuse increased the odds of stalking victimization by 56%. Findings also reveal that respondents with higher self-control are significantly less likely to be stalking victims compared to respondents with lower levels of self-control ($B = -.393$, $p > .05$). In fact, having higher self-control decreased the odds of stalking victimization by 33%. Respondents who reported engaging in sexual risk taking behaviors are significantly more likely to be victimized by stalking compared to respondents who did not report engaging in sexual risk taking behaviors ($B = .055$, $p > .05$). Engaging in risky sexual behavior increases the odds of stalking victimization by 6%. No statistically significant influences were found for race, attitudes toward women, residing off-campus, being in a dating relationship, witnessing parental abuse, consuming alcohol often, or using marijuana within the past year on stalking victimization.

Table 5-4. Logistic Regression Predicting Stalking Victimization (Full Sample; N = 1,365)

Variable	B	SE	Sig.	EXP (B)
Male	-.304*	.155	.049	.738
Offcamp	.079	.137	.565	1.082
Anydate	.266	.139	.055	1.305
White	.010	.140	.941	1.010
Witness Abuse	.329	.197	.095	1.390
Child victimization	.442**	.145	.002	1.556
Self-Control	-.393*	.180	.029	.675
Attwomen	-.014	.013	.299	.986
Alcohol	.128	.151	.395	1.137
Pot	.064	.154	.677	1.066
Sexrisk	.055**	.021	.008	1.057

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Separate logistic regression models were estimated for male and female stalking victimization. Table 5-5 below presents the findings for female stalking victimization. Only one variable was found to have a significant influence on stalking victimization among females. Females who witnessed violence between parents during childhood are more likely to be victims of stalking compared to females who did not witness parental abuse ($B = .481$, $p > .05$). Specifically, witnessing violence between parents increased

the odds of stalking victimization by 62% for females. Results reveal two variables significantly predict male stalking victimization. Table 5-6 below presents the findings from male stalking victimization models. Male respondents who experience childhood abuse were significantly more likely to be stalking victims compared to male respondents who did not experience childhood victimization ($B = .944, p > .01$). Experiencing childhood victimization increases the odds of stalking victimization by 157% for males. Furthermore, male respondents who report engaging in sexually risky behaviors are significantly more likely to be stalking victims compared to male respondents who do not engage in sexually risky behavior ($B = .072, p > .05$). Specifically, higher scores of sexual risk taking increase the odds of stalking victimization by 7% for males.

Table 5-5. Logistic Regression Predicting Stalking Victimization (Females Only; N = 907)

Variable	B	SE	Sig.	EXP (B)
Offcamp	.099	.163	.543	1.105
Anydate	.230	.171	.178	1.259
White	.174	.170	.308	1.190
Witness Abuse	.481*	.244	.049	1.618
Child victimization	.237	.180	.188	1.267
Self-Control	-.396	.212	.062	.673
Attwomen	-.009	.017	.609	.991
Alcohol	.096	.181	.593	1.101
Pot	.125	.189	.508	1.134
Sexrisk	.050	.026	.058	1.051

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Table 5-6. Logistic Regression Predicting Stalking Victimization (Males Only; N = 458)

Variable	B	SE	Sig.	EXP (B)
Offcamp	.020	.259	.937	1.021
Anydate	.390	.247	.114	1.477
White	-.354	.252	.160	.702
Witness Abuse	.055	.349	.874	1.057
Child victimization	.944**	.255	.000	2.570
Self-Control	-.413	.345	.230	.661
Attwomen	-.021	.022	.349	.980
Alcohol	.156	.278	.575	1.169
Pot	-.122	.271	.653	.885
Sexrisk	.072*	.035	.042	1.074

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Overall, the results from the logistic regression models indicate several significant relationships between predictor factors and stalking victimization and perpetration. Interestingly, exposure to abuse during childhood (either witnessing or experiencing abuse) is the single most predictive factor of stalking in every model (perpetration, full victimization, female victimization, and male victimization). It is also remarkable to note that, with the exception of gender differences, all other significant variables represent risky or dangerous behaviors. Childhood abuse, sexual risk taking, witnessing parental abuse, exhibiting low self-control, and using alcohol often are all factors that are associated with many other negative behaviors and consequences.

CHAPTER 6 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Famous early cases of celebrity stalking provoked the first anti-stalking legislation in 1990, followed by a sudden outbreak of new stalking laws for all fifty states as well as several other countries. Debates remain regarding legislation and definitions of stalking; however, most research adopts a general definition of stalking very similar to that of the NVAWS, which includes repetitive intrusive behaviors that are unwanted, frightening, and threatening to the victim. The purpose of this study was to identify factors that significantly predict stalking perpetration and victimization and to determine if these factors vary across gender. Of the 1,490 college students sampled, 25% report being victimized by stalking and almost 7% report perpetrating stalking. These prevalence rates, like most prevalence rates from college samples, are much higher than rates reported by the general public (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). Findings from the current research are consistent with previous research of stalking among college students that reports high levels of perpetration and victimization. Prior research identifies between 6% and 27% of college samples report victimization (Logan et al., 2000; McCreedy & Dennis, 1996) and between 1% and 8% report perpetration (Fremouw et al., 1997; Haugaard & Seri, 2003). The fact that one-quarter of the current study's sample has been stalked and 7% admit to being stalkers indicates that this is a phenomenon of concern on college campuses. This reveals a large gap between the proportion of students who report victimization and perpetration. The large gap between reported victims and

perpetrators indicates the possibility that stalkers are either less likely to attend college or more reluctant to admit to stalking.

Findings from the current study's analysis of risk factors for stalking reveal interesting similarities and differences in comparison with prior research. Gender differences were found for stalking victimization whereas females are at a significantly higher risk than males for being victims of stalking. This discovery contributes to prior research yielding findings that indicate females are more likely to be stalking victims (McCreedy & Dennis, 1996). On the contrary, some prior research failed to find gender differences for stalking victimization (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2000). The findings of the current study also indicate no gender differences were found for stalking perpetration. Although this finding is supported by prior research (Dye & Davis, 2003; Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al, 2000), other research indicates males are significantly more likely to perpetrate stalking (Bjerregaard, 2000; Logan et al., 2000). The finding of no gender difference for stalking perpetration in the current study illustrates stalking is no longer a crime thought to be committed exclusively by males.

Results indicate individuals who report drinking alcohol often within the past year are significantly more likely to be perpetrators of stalking. This finding is similar to that of prior research (Logan et al., 2000; Mustaine & Tewskbury, 1999). Interestingly, almost half of the sample (46%) indicated drinking often although only 22% of the sample is of legal age to drink (21 or older). The link between alcohol and stalking may indicate that individuals who are likely to drink more heavily than others, and especially those who are likely to drink illegally, are more likely to engage in the criminal behavior of stalking.

Findings also illustrate a strong positive relationship between sexual risk taking behavior and stalking victimization. Consistent with Haugaard and Seri (2003), respondents who engage in risky sexual behavior (experiencing sexual intercourse at a younger age and having more sexual partners) are at a higher level of risk for being stalked. The current findings indicate that individuals more willing to place themselves at a greater risk sexually may be more likely to take other risks, such as placing themselves in situations where they might encounter potential stalking perpetrators.

Of the risk factors that are unique to this analysis, several important findings are revealed. The results reveal that experiencing childhood victimization significantly increases the probability of becoming a stalking victim or perpetrator during college. Child abuse is known to have many negative outcomes and the findings of this study indicate that stalking victimization can now be added to the lengthy list of harmful behavior associated with childhood victimization. Attachment theory was not tested in the current study, however this finding of childhood abuse as a predictive factor for stalking would not surprise attachment theorists. This finding is in line with the work of attachment theorists such that early attachments with caregivers (whether they be positive or negative) remain relatively stable over the life course. Therefore, individuals who experience abuse during childhood may be more likely to form negative attachments with guardians at an early age and continue the cycle of violence. In fact, social learning theory may be effectively applied to explain the phenomenon of childhood abuse victims' later exposure to crime. According to social learning theory, individuals are conditioned, or socialized, by parental guardians and peers to engage in certain behaviors (Akers, 1977). Further, individuals learn to behave violently or criminally from socialization

experiences early in life (Akers, 1977; Sutherland, 1939). Therefore, it is likely that children who are abused develop emotionally and psychologically damaging manifestations of their abuse. It can be speculated that some individuals exposed to childhood violence may be more susceptible to further victimization (i.e., stalking). Furthermore, findings indicate that witnessing violence between parents significantly predicts stalking victimization, but for females only. This finding, similar to that of child abuse, seems to indicate that respondents who observed violence among parents during childhood might have socially learned that violence is normal. Individuals who have been victimized (by either witnessing or experiencing abuse) may be more likely to become a repeat victim, which is often called the cycle of victimization. Dumas, Margolin, and John (1994) found that witnessing parental violence during childhood is associated with males perpetrating abuse and females victimization of abuse later in life. It is possible, then, that individuals exposed to abuse early in life will enter a cycle of victimization.

Findings show self-control is significantly associated with stalking victimization. Respondents with lower self-control are significantly more likely to be victims of stalking. Prior research also identifies low self-control as a risk factor for criminal victimization (Schreck, 1999; Steward et al., 2004). Findings from the current study not only support the discoveries from these recent and innovative studies, but also add support for a new application of Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) general theory of crime. The general theory of crime has never before been applied to the crime of stalking and this analysis yielded interesting findings. The current study finds no support for the general theory of crime's application to stalking perpetration, but offers new support for

the theory's application to stalking victimization. Findings indicate that individuals reporting lower self-control are more likely to be victims (not perpetrators) of stalking. According to Grasmick et al. (1993), individuals with low self-control are more likely to be impulsive, inactive, self-centered, and risk seeking. It is logical, then, that individuals with lower self-control are more likely to place themselves in riskier situations (perhaps in closer proximity to stalkers).

There are several limitations associated with the current study that may somewhat limit generalizability. First, the sample is comprised of college students who are primarily female (65%) and White (64%). Furthermore, participants were surveyed from liberal arts and sciences courses. Findings may differ if sampling students from other disciplines, the general population, or by including an equal proportion of participants across gender and race. The second limitation of this study is the restricted capability of the survey measures. Originally, the "Family and Relationship Experiences and Attitudes among College Students" survey (Fox et al., 2005) was intended to capture a wide variety of college student behaviors, attitudes, and experiences. The survey was not limited to only measuring specific stalking behaviors. Because this survey was not created solely with stalking in mind, the measure is limited in the quantity and breadth of stalking-related inquiries.

More specific limitations of the current study involve the construction of some variables. Alcohol use was significantly associated with stalking perpetration, however it is impossible to determine how 'often' is 'often.' Perhaps a clear distinction between drinking frequently and drinking to excess would alleviate this uncertainty. Although the measure of living off-campus was not associated with the perpetration or victimization of

stalking, this measure might be better suited as a series of questions first inquiring if students reside on- or off-campus and then asking where and with whom they live. The current measure inquires only of on- or off-campus status and, therefore, does not yield information as to what type of residence (apartment, dormitory, house, fraternity/sorority house, etc.) or if participants live alone, with roommates, or family members. Living off-campus may be a sign of higher socioeconomic status (as off-campus housing is typically more costly than on-campus housing) or higher class standing (as juniors/seniors may be more likely to move away from campus). Living off-campus may also be a result of many University of Florida students receiving free tuition and having more money to spend on other expenses, such as housing.

The scale measuring witnessing violence between parents has a reliability score of .57. This scale was comprised of two questions inquiring if respondents had ever witnessed their father hit their mother or witnessed their mother hit their father. In the earlier survey instructions for the section of “Family of Origin Violence,” participants were asked to respond to questions about their male and female guardians. This enabled respondents to consider their experiences with caregivers (such as a step-parent or other guardian) other than their biological mother and/or father. These instructions were not reiterated when participants were asked to respond to witnessing parental abuse questions. For the witnessing parental abuse questions, respondents were asked to answer ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to the questions “When you were a child, did you ever see your father hit your mother?” and “When you were a child, did you ever see your mother hit your father?” Therefore, respondents may have forgotten or misunderstood that they were to answer the questions about witnessing violence between parents while

considering the abusive behavior of their primary guardians (perhaps not their mother or father). Also, the survey responses of 'yes' and 'no' did not allow for respondents to indicate if they had grown up in a single parent home. Consequently, respondents may have been forced to indicate that they had not witnessed their mother hit their father, even if they did not know their mother or if their mother had never been part of the family. Furthermore, participants may have responded that they did not witness their father hit their mother, when, in fact, they saw their mother's new husband or boyfriend had physically abused their mother. Had these limitations for measurement of witnessing violence between parents been corrected and clarified, significant findings for stalking perpetration and witnessing parental abuse may have been found.

Measurement of the dependent variables (stalking victimization and perpetration) also had limitations. Analyses were unable to determine variation among perpetration or victimization given the fact that respondents were only asked to reply to the question: "Has anyone done any of these things to you on more than one occasion?" Information as to how many times one has been a victim or perpetrator of stalking is unavailable. Therefore, victims or perpetrators were not divided into groups of 'high,' 'medium,' and 'low' depending on number of times victimized or perpetrated. Also, respondents were not questioned as to the duration of the stalking episode. Variation among duration would also have been useful for placing victims or perpetrators into ordinal categories. Although the survey does inquire of respondent's experiences with nine particular stalking behaviors, this is not an adequate representation of the degree to which one is a victim or perpetrator. For example, a victim may have indicated experiencing all nine stalking behaviors, but may have only experienced each behavior once over the course of

a week. Another victim may have indicated experiencing only one or two of the nine stalking behaviors, but may have endured those stalking behaviors for months or years. Therefore it is impossible to determine the severity of the crime by analyzing only the number of stalking behaviors respondents have experienced or perpetrated. Considering the measures used in the current study, it is also not possible to determine how many different stalkers a victim has had or how many victims each stalker has stalked. This, too, would have been valuable information needed to determine the severity of the stalking and to classify victims and perpetrators. The measurement of stalking is also limited due to the fact that the survey requires respondents to reply to their experiences with only nine stalking behaviors. Therefore, if a respondent had been stalked before, but by different means other than any of the nine listed behaviors, they would not be recognized as a victim of stalking for purposes of this research. It is presumed the number of victims unidentified due to the limits of the survey questions is very small due to the fact that the nine stalking survey items were broad enough to include most incidences of stalking.

Recommendations for future research would include retesting the same variables used in the present analysis along with the mentioned changes with college and general public samples to strengthen the predictability of stalking risk factors. Future tests of the effects of child abuse and attitudes toward women on stalking are specifically needed to compare with the findings of this study. Future research would also benefit from introducing untested factors into an analysis of stalking to determine their predictability. Additional theoretical tests, both retests of the theories previously applied to stalking and theories that have not yet been tested, are especially needed in future research. A retest

of the theoretical predictive power of self-control on stalking perpetration and victimization is much needed. A very recent trend within the stalking literature and legislation seems to focus on or, at the very least includes, measures of cyberstalking. One of nine questions in the current study inquired of cyberstalking behavior (unwanted emails), however it is apparent that sending unwanted emails is a limited element of cyberstalking behaviors and future research would certainly benefit from questioning respondents about a multitude of cyberstalking behaviors.¹ Considering the level of exposure and reliance upon electronic communication in today's world, a further interest in the realm of cyberstalking might identify the most common cyberstalking behavior or examining the rate at which perpetrators employ electronic means of harassment.

Furthermore, future stalking research may benefit from not only inquiring if respondents have experienced specific stalking behaviors more than once, but also by directly asking if the respondent is a victim/perpetrator of stalking. Most prior research has traditionally either provided respondents with a definition of stalking and inquired of specific behaviors or has allowed the respondent to independently conceptualize the meaning of stalking and answer based on their own perceptions of the definition of stalking. This proposed approach of incorporating both methods seems to combine both strategies used by researchers and may yield interesting differences between those who are legally perpetrators/victims and those who are perceived perpetrators/victims.²

¹ Other cyberstalking behaviors might include: monitoring online purchases, accounts, or personal information; covertly obtaining information; hacking into emails or other personal accounts; sending unwanted text messages or instant messages; and posting harassing comments on personal or public websites.

² With data from the NVAWS, Tjaden et al. (2000) compared stalking victimization from both legal and victim perspectives, the only study found to date that compares both types of reports of stalking.

Policy changes are needed to reduce the crime of stalking. Policy implications offered based on this research should be interpreted with caution due to generalizability issues of the sample. It is certainly possible that the University of Florida is a unique population and future research should first determine if the same risk variables predict stalking perpetration and victimization before implementing policy changes. Policy makers should first address the inconsistencies in legal definitions of stalking across states. As discussed in the review of stalking legislation, states vary considerably as to the elements needed to constitute the crime of stalking has been committed and states also differ as to the severity of the criminal charge and punishment. Melton (2000) advocates standardizing and increasing criminal charges across states to felonies (not misdemeanors) for stalking perpetrators. Several researchers state that police officers should express more concern over the crime of stalking (Fisher et al., 2002; National Institute of Justice, 1996; Melton, 2000). Policy makers should allocate additional funds to law enforcement agencies and organizations that aim to protect and assist victims of stalking. With additional resources, law enforcement agencies will be better equipped to offer police officers with supplemental training designed to teach ways to recognize and reduce stalking as well as offering victims help and appropriate advice.

Findings from the present study point toward specific policy implications that attempt to prevent stalking perpetration and provide resources for stalking victims. It is important to note that exposure to abuse during childhood (either witnessing or experiencing abuse) is found to be the only risk factor predictive of stalking in every model (perpetration for the full model and victimization for full model, female model, and male model). Results indicate individuals exposed to abuse during childhood are

significantly more likely to be stalking victims and perpetrators. Although policy makers and society are well aware by now that child abuse occurs, it is important that they be reminded of the seriousness and negative consequences associated with the abuse of children. Policy implications for the identification and reduction of child abuse should include mandatory and regular training for individuals that work with children (such as teachers and day care workers). Although teachers are educated in identifying typical warning signs of child abuse, additional and regular training is needed to ensure teachers can appropriately approach students about their suspicions and report such suspicions to the proper authorities. Teachers (primarily in elementary K-12 grades) should openly teach students about appropriate and inappropriate parent-child interactions and encourage children to talk to them or others if they are experiencing abuse at home. Additionally, children might benefit from visits from the school counselor to speak on the subject of child abuse. These visits would educate children as to the crime of child abuse and encourage children to approach the counselor if needed. Furthermore, police and social services organizations should be allotted additional resources to investigate reported instances of child abuse. Some of these policy recommendations have been implemented but are not enforced or regularly practiced. Combating the occurrence of child abuse may reduce stalking victimization and perpetration.

Findings from the current study reveal individuals who use alcohol often are significantly more likely to perpetrate stalking. Policy recommendations aimed to reduce alcohol consumption might more successfully target younger individuals (such as high school and college students) who are likely to begin experimenting with alcohol. Campus alcohol coalitions may require additional funding in order to adequately send a

message that drinking alcohol to excess can have negative criminal consequences (in addition to negative health consequences).

Policy implications designed to address the finding of low self-control among stalking victims may be best targeted to parents of young children. Classes or resources available to new or expecting parents may better prepare them to encourage high levels of self-control early in their children's lives. Children who learn to be impulsive, inactive, self-centered, risk seeking, who strive only for simple tasks, and who easily lose their temper are more likely to exhibit lower levels of self-control. Parents who actively combat these destructive habits and behaviors may counteract their children's likelihood of low self-control.

Results from this study indicated that victims of stalking were significantly more likely to engage in sexual risk taking (experiencing sexual intercourse at a younger age and having more intimate partners). Policy suggestions designed to decrease the proportion of individuals engaging in sexual risk taking behaviors should focus on the role of educators. Schoolteachers naturally influence their students and should candidly discuss the consequences of premature sexual behavior. Lectures of this sort should be directed toward older elementary students, junior high/middle school students, and high school students alike since many students are exposed to sexual behavior at young ages. In addition to classroom lectures on safe sexual behavior for students, schools should also strive to teach parents the importance of talking to their children about safe sexual conduct. These policy suggestions place more responsibility on schools and teachers because the school may be the only exposure many children get outside of the home and it is important to educate as many children as possible about risky sexual behavior.

Traditionally, parents and schools have been very reluctant to assign schools the responsibility of educating children about topics regarding sexuality. Perhaps in the future policy makers, educators, and parents can reach an agreement that will allow educators to impart some level of guidance to students on sexual risk taking behaviors. Again, these identified policy implications should be considered with caution as research investigating the reliability of predictive factors of stalking perpetration and victimization are in developmental stages.

Overall, the results of the present study demonstrate potential for future research to successfully identify risk factors predictive of stalking perpetration and victimization. This study found child abuse and alcohol use to be significantly associated with the perpetration of stalking. Individuals who report childhood victimization, low self-control, and sexual risk taking are significantly more likely to be victimized by stalking. Results also indicate a gender difference among stalking victims and confirm that females who witness child abuse are more likely to be stalking victims whereas males who experience child abuse and sexual risk taking are more likely to be stalking victims. Interestingly, findings reveal that exposure to violence during childhood (witnessing or experiencing abuse) is the only factor predictive of both stalking perpetration and victimization. Stalking is a serious crime that demands serious attention from law enforcement agencies, public policy makers, and society. Given the damaging social implications of ignoring the crime of stalking, law enforcement agencies, public policy makers, and researchers should continue to devote time and resources to the prevention of stalking.

APPENDIX A
POTENTIAL STALKING BEHAVIORS

Following
Watching
Spying
Sending unsolicited letters
Sending unsolicited written correspondence
Sending unwanted emails
Sending unwanted text messages
Sending unwanted instant messages
Sending unwanted pager calls
Telephone calling
Leaving unwanted messages
Leaving unwanted gifts in places such as home, office, school, etc.
Leaving unwanted items
Standing outside places such as home, office, school, etc.
Showing up in places with no business being there
Vandalizing property or valuables
Threatening behavior (verbal or nonverbal)
Physically threatening behavior
Harassing behaviors
Pursuit behaviors
Surveillance
Initiating or escalating unwanted romantic behaviors
Monitoring
Exaggerated affection
Invading property
Kidnapping/Restraining
Physically endangering
Intruding in interactions
Covertly obtaining information
Sexually coercing
Murder
Intruding on friends/family
Stealing property/valuables
Eavesdropping
Intruding on victims family/friends
Hacking into emails, accounts, or personal information
Seeking employment at victim's work

APPENDIX B
SURVEY

University of Florida
An Investigation of Family and Relationship Experiences
And Attitudes Among College Students

DEMOGRAPHICS – SECTION A

Please answer the following questions about your background.
Circle the number that corresponds to the answer that you select.

A1 What is your sex?

- 1 Male
- 2 Female

A2 What is your age?

- 1 18 years old
- 2 19 years old
- 3 20 years old
- 4 21 or older

A3 What is your class standing?

- 1 Freshman
- 2 Sophomore
- 3 Junior
- 4 Senior
- 5 Graduate

A4 What type of household did you mostly live in while you grow up?

- 1 I lived with my two biological parents
- 2 I lived with a single parent
- 3 I lived with a parent and a stepparent
- 4 I lived with adoptive parents
- 5 Other relatives (grandparents, aunt/uncle, siblings, etc.)
- 6 Other

A5 Where do you live?

- 1 on campus
- 2 off campus

A6 What is your current relational status?

- 1 Not currently Dating
- 2 Occasionally Dating
- 3 Steady/Exclusively Dating
- 4 Engaged
- 5 Married
- 6 Divorced
- 7 Other

A7 How often do you see the person you are dating?

- 1 Not currently dating
- 2 A few times a year
- 3 Once or twice a month
- 4 Once a week
- 5 Twice a week
- 6 Three or more times a week

A 8 Are you currently living with the person you are dating?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 I am not currently dating someone

A9 What is your race?

- 1 White, non-Hispanic
- 2 White, Hispanic
- 3 Black or African-American
- 4 Asian
- 5 Pacific Islander
- 6 American Indian or Alaskan Native
- 7 Other

FAMILY OF ORIGIN VIOLENCE – SECTION B

Now we are going to ask you some questions about violence you may have experienced as a child. Think back to your childhood for how often each of the following behaviors occurred. If your mother or father did not raise you, please answer the questions about the person who did raise you.

<i>When you were a child did any parent, stepparent or guardian ever...</i>	Yes	No
B1 Throw something at you that could hurt you?	1	2
B2 Push, grab, or shove you?	1	2
B3 Pull your hair?	1	2
B4 Slap or hit you?	1	2
B5 Kick or bite you?	1	2
B6 Choke or attempt to drown you?	1	2
B7 Hit you with some object? (not including spanking)	1	2
B8 Beat you up?	1	2
B9 Punish you with a belt, board, cord, or other hard object? (not including spanking)	1	2
B10 Hit you so hard that it left bruises or marks?	1	2
B11 Touched you in a sexual way when you did not want that to happen?	1	2
B12 Hurt you in a sexual way?	1	2

B13 When you were a child, did you ever see your father hit your mother?

- 1 Yes
2 No

B14 When you were a child, did you ever see your mother hit your father?

- 1 Yes
2 No

B15 When you were a child, did any parent, stepparent, or guardian ever spank you as a form of discipline?

- 1 Yes
2 No

ATTITUDES TOWARD WOMEN—SECTION C

The next set of questions asks you about your opinions and attitudes about women. Please remember that this is a confidential survey and your answers can't be linked to you. Please answer the questions honestly.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
C1 Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than of a man.	1	2	3	4
C2 Under modern economic conditions with women being active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing the laundry.	1	2	3	4
C3 It is insulting to women to have the "obey" clause remain in the marriage service.	1	2	3	4
C4 A woman should be free as a man to propose marriage.	1	2	3	4
C5 Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.	1	2	3	4
C6 Women earning as much as their dates should bear equally the expense when they go out together.	1	2	3	4
C7 Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professions along with men.	1	2	3	4
C8 A woman should not expect to go to exactly the same places or to have quite the same freedom of action as a man.	1	2	3	4
C9 Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters.	1	2	3	4
C10 In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in the bringing up of children.	1	2	3	4
C11 The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men.	1	2	3	4
C12 There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted.	1	2	3	4
C13 Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in the various trades.	1	2	3	4

STALKING VICTIMIZATION – SECTION D

The following section asks you about **frightening or harassing things** someone may have done to you. Not including bill collectors, telephone solicitors, or other sales people, please indicate if anyone, male or female, has ever done any of these things to you. You may have experienced the following behaviors from strangers, former boyfriends/girlfriends, or acquaintances.

HAS ANYONE EVER...	Yes	No
D1 Followed, watched, or spied on you	1	2
D2 Sent you unsolicited letters, written correspondence, or unwanted emails	1	2
D3 Made unwanted phone calls to you	1	2
D4 Left unwanted messages for you	1	2
D5 Stood outside your home, school, or workplace	1	2
D6 Showed up at places you were even though he or she had no business being there	1	2
D7 Left unwanted items for you to find	1	2
D8 Tried to communicate with you in other ways against your will	1	2
D9 Vandalized your property or destroyed something you loved	1	2

If you answered **YES** to any of the above questions, GO TO QUESTION #**D10-D13**

If you answered **NO** to any of the above questions, GO TO QUESTION #**D14**

D10 What was your relationship with the person(s) who did these things to you...
(MARK ALL THAT APPLY)

- 1 Your current boyfriend or girlfriend
- 2 An ex boyfriend or girlfriend
- 3 A Friend
- 4 An Acquaintance
- 5 A stranger
- 6 Don't know

D11 Has anyone done any of these things to you on more than one occasion?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

D12 Have you ever reported any of the above behaviors to the police/authorities?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

If Yes, go to **D13**

If No, go to **D14**

D13 How satisfied were you with the way the police/authorities handled the situation?

- 1 Very Satisfied
- 2 Satisfied
- 3 Dissatisfied
- 4 Very Dissatisfied

STALKING PERPETRATION

The following section asks you about **frightening or harassing things** that you may have done to someone else. Not including bill collectors, telephone solicitors, or other sales people, please indicate if have done any of these things to another person including strangers, former boyfriends/girlfriends, or acquaintances.

<i>HAVE YOU EVER...</i>	Yes	No
D14 Followed, watched, or spied on someone	1	2
D15 Sent unsolicited letters, written correspondence, or unwanted emails to someone	1	2
D16 Made unsolicited phone calls to someone	1	2
D17 Left unwanted messages for someone	1	2
D18 Stood outside the home, school, or workplace of someone	1	2
D19 Showed up at places you had no business being	1	2
D20 Left unwanted items for someone to find	1	2
D21 Tried to communicate with someone in other ways against their will	1	2
D22 Vandalized someone's property or destroyed something they loved	1	2

If you answered **YES** to any of the above questions, GO TO QUESTION #**D23-D24**

If you answered **NO** to any of the above questions, GO TO QUESTION #**E1**

D23 What was your relationship with the person(s) you did these things to...

(MARK ALL THAT APPLY)

- 1 Your current boyfriend or girlfriend
- 2 An ex boyfriend or girlfriend
- 3 A Friend
- 4 An Acquaintance
- 5 A stranger
- 6 Don't know

D24 Did you do any of these things to someone on more than one occasion?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

FEAR OF VIOLENCE – SECTION E

Campus safety is an important issue to students. The next set of questions asks you about your fear of crime and things you might do to protect yourself.

E1 Do you think personal safety for women in this country has improved since you were a child, gotten worse since you were a child, or stayed about the same?

- 1 Improved
- 2 Gotten worse
- 3 Stayed about the same
- 4 Don't know

E2 How concerned are you about your own personal safety? Are you...

- 1 Very concerned
- 2 Somewhat concerned
- 3 Slightly concerned
- 4 Not really concerned

E3 Are you afraid to walk across campus alone at night?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

E4 Do you walk across campus alone at night?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

E5 Do you ever carry something with you to defend yourself or to alert other people?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

If Yes, go to **E6**
If No, go to **F1**

E6 How often do you carry something with you to defend yourself or to alert other people? Would you say...

- 1 Always
- 2 Usually
- 3 Sometimes
- 4 Never

If You answered 1, 2 or 3, please go to question **#E7**. If You answered 4, please go to question **#F1**

E7 What do you carry?

(MARK ALL THAT APPLY)

- 1 Whistle, noise maker/personal alarm
- 2 Mace, other spray
- 3 Knife, sharp object
- 4 Gun
- 5 Keychain, keys
- 6 Stick, bat, club/other blunt object
- 7 Dog
- 8 Martial arts/fists
- 9 Cell phone
- 10 Other

RELATIONSHIP BEHAVIORS – SECTION F

No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, or just have spats or fights because they are in a bad mood. This is a list of things that might happen when you and your partner are not getting along. Please circle how many times you did each of these things **in the past year**, and how many times your partner did them to you **in the past year**. If you or your partner did not do one of these things in the past year, but it happened before that, circle “5.”

How often did this happen in the past year?

- 0 = This has never happened
 1 = Once in the past year
 2 = Twice in the past year
 3 = 3-5 times in the past year
 4 = 6 or more times in the past year
 5 = Not in the past year, but it did happen before

	This has never happened	Once in the past year	Twice in the past year	3-5 times in the past year	6 or more times in the past year	Not in the past year, but it did happen before
F1 Threw something at my partner that could hurt.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F2 My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F3 Twisted my partner’s arm or hair.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F4 My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F5 I kicked my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F6 My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F7 I slapped my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F8 My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F9 I pushed or shoved my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F10 My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F11 I punched or hit my partner with my hand or an object.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F12 My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F13 I choked my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F14 My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F15 I slammed my partner against a wall.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F16 My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F17 I grabbed my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F18 My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F19 I threatened to hit or throw something at my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F20 My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F21 I prevented my partner from seeing family or friends.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F22 My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F23 I insisted on knowing my partners whereabouts all the time.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F24 My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F25 I insisted on knowing who my partner was talking to on the phone.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F26 My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F27 I insulted or swore at my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F28 My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5

F29	I accused my partner of being a lousy lover.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F30	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F31	I called my partner bad names.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F32	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F33	I shouted or yelled at my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F34	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F35	I used threats to make my partner have sex.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F36	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F37	I made my partner have sex without a condom.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F38	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F39	I used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make my partner have sex (vaginal, oral, and/or anal).	0	1	2	3	4	5
F40	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F41	I insisted on sex (vaginal, oral, and/or anal) when my partner did not want to (but did not use physical force).	0	1	2	3	4	5
F42	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5

PROTECTIVE/RISK FACTORS – SECTION G

The next set of questions ask you about your past behavior. Again, please remember that this is a confidential survey and your answers can't be linked to you. Please answer the following questions honestly.

G1 How old were you when you had sexual intercourse for the first time?

- 1 Thirteen or younger
- 2 Fourteen
- 3 Fifteen
- 4 Sixteen
- 5 Seventeen
- 6 Eighteen or older
- 7 I have never had sexual intercourse

G2 During your life, how many people have you had sexual intercourse with?

- 1 1 partner
- 2 2 partners
- 3 3 partners
- 4 4 partners
- 5 5 partners
- 6 6 partners or more
- 7 I have never had sexual intercourse

G3 During the last three months, how many people have you had sexual intercourse with?

- 1 1 partner
- 2 2 partners
- 3 3 partners
- 4 4 partners
- 5 5 partners
- 6 6 partners or more
- 7 I did not have sexual intercourse during the past 3 months
- 8 I have never had sexual intercourse

	Never	Once	A few times	Often
In the past year, did you...				
G4 Drink alcohol?	1	2	3	4
G5 Use marijuana?	1	2	3	4
G6 Use hard drugs like cocaine or heroin?	1	2	3	4
G7 Smoke cigarettes?	1	2	3	4
G8 Use fake ID's?	1	2	3	4
G9 Drink and drive?	1	2	3	4

	Never	Once	A few times	Often
In the past year, did your close friends...				
G10 Drink alcohol?	1	2	3	4
G11 Use marijuana?	1	2	3	4
G12 Use hard drugs like cocaine or heroin?	1	2	3	4
G13 Smoke cigarettes?	1	2	3	4
G14 Use fake ID's?	1	2	3	4
G15 Drink and drive?	1	2	3	4

G16 How old were you when you first tried drugs?

- 1 Thirteen or younger
- 2 Fourteen
- 3 Fifteen
- 4 Sixteen
- 5 Seventeen
- 6 Eighteen or older
- 7 I have never tried drugs

G17 How old were you when you first had more than a sip of alcohol?

- 1 Thirteen or younger
- 2 Fourteen
- 3 Fifteen
- 4 Sixteen
- 5 Seventeen
- 6 Eighteen or older
- 7 I have never tried alcohol

G18 In the last year, how often did you attend religious services?

- 1 Never
- 2 Seldom
- 3 Monthly
- 4 Weekly

G19 How religious are you?

- 1 Not religious
2 Moderately religious
3 Very religious

SELF-CONTROL—SECTION H

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
H1 I often act on the spur of the moment without stopping to think.	1	2	3	4
H2 I don't devote much thought and effort to preparing for the future.	1	2	3	4
H3 I often do whatever brings me pleasure here and now, even at the cost of some distant goal.	1	2	3	4
H4 I'm more concerned with what happens to me in the short run than in the long run.	1	2	3	4
H5 I frequently try to avoid projects that I know will be difficult.	1	2	3	4
H6 When things get complicated, I tend to quit or withdraw.	1	2	3	4
H7 The things in life that are easiest to do bring me most pleasure.	1	2	3	4
H8 I dislike really hard tasks that stretch my abilities to the limit.	1	2	3	4
H9 I like to test myself every now and then by doing something a little risky.	1	2	3	4
H10 Sometimes I will take a risk just for the fun of it.	1	2	3	4
H11 I sometimes find it exciting to do things for which I might get in trouble.	1	2	3	4
H12 Excitement and adventure are more important to me than security.	1	2	3	4
H13 If I had a choice, I would almost always rather do something physical than something mental.	1	2	3	4
H14 I almost always feel better when I am on the move than when I am sitting and thinking.	1	2	3	4
H15 I like to get out and do things more than I like to read or contemplate ideas.	1	2	3	4
H16 I often look out for myself first, even if it means making things difficult for other people	1	2	3	4
H17 I'm not very sympathetic to other people when they are having problems.	1	2	3	4
H18 If things I do upset people, its their problem not mine.	1	2	3	4
H19 I will try to get the things I want even when I know it causes problems for other people.	1	2	3	4
H20 I lose my temper pretty easily.	1	2	3	4
H21 Often, when I'm angry at people I feel more like hurting them than talking to them about why I am angry.	1	2	3	4
H22 When I'm really angry, other people better stay away from me.	1	2	3	4
H23 When I have a serious disagreement with someone, it's usually hard for me to talk calmly about it without getting upset.	1	2	3	4

ATTACHMENT TO PARENTAL FIGURES—SECTION I

Please answer the following questions about your current relationship with your parents, step-parents, or guardians.

ATTACHMENT TO MOM

<i>Please answer these questions about your mom/female guardian...</i>	Never	Sometimes	Half of the Time	Usually	Always
I1 How often do you trust your mom/female guardian?	1	2	3	4	5
I2 How often do you feel you can talk to her about your problems?	1	2	3	4	5
I3 How often do you think she is genuinely interested in you?	1	2	3	4	5
I4 How often do you feel that she supports you?	1	2	3	4	5

ATTACHMENT TO DAD

<i>Please answer these questions about your dad/male guardian...</i>	Never	Sometimes	Half of the Time	Usually	Always
I5 How often do you trust your dad/male guardian?	1	2	3	4	5
I6 How often do you feel you can talk to him about your problems?	1	2	3	4	5
I7 How often do you think he is genuinely interested in you?	1	2	3	4	5
I8 How often do you feel that he supports you ?	1	2	3	4	5

PARENTAL ATTACHMENT

	Yes	No	Not Applicable
I9 I would like to be the kind of person my father/male guardian is.	1	2	3
I10 I would like to be the kind of person my mother/female guardian is.	1	2	3
I11 I talk over future plans with my parents/guardians	1	2	3
I12 My mother/female guardian seems to understand me	1	2	3
I13 My father/male guardian understands me	1	2	3
I14 Would your mother/female guardian stick by you if you got into really bad trouble?	1	2	3
I15 Would your father/male guardian stick by you if you got into really bad trouble?	1	2	3

This is the end of the survey. Thank you for taking the time to participate in this research.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Ainsworth, M.D.S. (1989). Attachments beyond infancy. *American Psychologist*, *44*, 709-716.
- Akers, R. (1977). *Deviant behavior: A social learning approach*. Belmont MA: Wadsworth: NY.
- Akers, R.L. (1991) Self-control as a General Theory of Crime. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *7*, 201-211.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed). Washington, DC: Author.
- Alabama Code § 13 A-6-90 (1992).
- Alaska Statue § 11.41.260 (1993).
- Baron, S.W. (2003). Self-control, social consequences, and criminal behavior: Street youth and the General Theory of Crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *40*, 403-425.
- Bjerregaard, B. (2000). An empirical study of stalking victimization. *Violence and Victims*, *15*, 389-406.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). Attachment and loss: Vol. I. Attachment. New York: Basic Books.
- Burgess, A., Baker, T., Greening, D., Hartman, C., Burgess, A., Douglass, J., & Halloran, R. (1997). Stalking behaviors within domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, *12*, 389-403.
- Burgess, A.W., Harner, H., Baker, T., Hartman, C.R., & Lole, C. (2001). Batterers stalking patterns. *Journal of Family Violence*, *16*, 309-321.
- Brewster, M.P. (2000). Stalking by former intimates: Verbal threats and other predictors of physical violence. *Violence and Victims*, *15*, 41-54.
- California Penal Code § 646.9 (1990).
- Caliso, J.A., & Milner, J.S. (1992). Childhood history of abuse and childhood abuse screening. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, *16*, 647-659.

- Cohen, L.E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review*, *44*, 588-608.
- Cohn, E.G., & Farrington, D.P. (1998). Assessing the quality of American doctoral program faculty in criminology and criminal justice, 1991-1995. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *9*, 187-210.
- Coleman, F.L. (1997). Stalking behavior and the cycle of domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *12*, 420-432.
- Colorado Rev. Stat. §18-9-111 (1995).
- Connecticut Gen. Stat. § 53a-181-c (1992).
- Cupach, W.R., & Spitzberg, B.H. (1998). Obsessive relational intrusion and stalking. In B.H. Spitzberg & W.R. Cupach (Eds.), *The dark side of close relationships* (pp. 233-263). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cupach, W.R., & Spitzberg, B.H. (2000). Obsessive relational intrusion: Incidence, perceived severity, and coping. *Violence and Victims*, *15*, 357-372.
- 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*, 407-424.
- Davis, K.E., & Frieze, I.H. (2000). Research on stalking: What do we know and where do we go? *Violence and Victims*, *15*, 473-487.
- Dietz, P.E., Matthews, D.B., Martell, D.A., Stewart, T., Hrouda, D.R., & Warren, J. (1991). Threatening and otherwise inappropriate letters to members of the United States congress. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, *36*, 1445-1468.
- Dietz, P.E., Matthews, D.B., Van Duyne, C., Martell, D.A., Parry, C.D.H., Stewart, T., Warren, J., & Crowder, J.D. (1991). Threatening and otherwise inappropriate letters to Hollywood celebrities. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, *36*, 185-209.
- Doumas, D., Margolin, G., & John, R.S. (1994). The intergenerational transmission of aggression across three generations. *Journal of Family Violence*, *9*, 157-175.
- Dye, M.L., & Davis, K.E. (2003). Stalking and psychological abuse: Common factors and relationship-specific characteristics. *Violence and Victims*, *18*, 163-180.
- Etaugh, C., & Spandikow, D.B. (1981). Changing attitudes toward women: A longitudinal study of college students. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *5*, 591-594.
- Emerson, R.M., Ferris, K.O., & Gardner, C.B. (1998). On being stalked. *Social Problems*, *45*, 289-314.

- Evans, T.D., Cullen, F.T., Burton Jr., V.S., Dunaway, R.G., & Benson, M.L. (1997). The social consequences of self-control: Testing the general theory of crime. *Criminology*, *35*, 475-504.
- Fein, R.A., & Vossekuil, B. (1998). Preventing attacks on public officials and public figures: A Secret Service perspective. In J.R. Meloy (Ed.), *The psychology of stalking: Clinical and forensic perspectives* (pp. 175-191). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Fisher, B.S., Cullen, F.T., & Turner, M.G. (2002). Being pursued: Stalking victimization in a national study of college women. *Criminology & Public Policy*, *1*, 257-308.
- Florida Stat. Ann. § 784.048 (1992).
- Fremouw, B., Westrup, D., & Pennypacker, J. (1996). Stalking on campus: The prevalence and strategies for coping with stalking. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, *42*, 666-669.
- Forde, D.R., & Kennedy, L.W. (1997). Risky lifestyles, routine activities, and the general theory of crime. *Justice Quarterly*, *14*, 265-294.
- Fox, K.A., Robson, S.L., Gover, A.R., & Kaukinen, K. (November 2005). *The intergenerational transmission of violence: A gender-based analysis of social learning theory*. Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology. Toronto, Canada.
- Georgia Code Ann. § 16-5-90 (1993).
- Gottfredson, M.R. (1987). Peer group interventions to reduce the risk of delinquent behavior: A selective review and a new evaluation. *Criminology*, *25*, 671-714.
- Gottfredson, M.R. & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Grasmick, H.G., Tittle, C.R., Bursick, Jr., R.J., & Arneklev, B.J. (1993). Testing the core empirical implications of Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory of crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *30*, 5-29.
- Hall, D.M. (1998) The victims of stalking. In *The psychology of stalking: Clinical and forensic perspectives* (ed. J.R. Meloy), pp. 113-137. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Haugaard, J.L., & Seri, L.G. (2001). Stalking and other forms of intrusive contact in adolescent and young-adult relationships. *University of Missouri-Kansas City Law Review*, *69*, 227-238.

- Haugaard, J.L., & Seri, L.G. (2003). Stalking and other forms of intrusive contact after the dissolution of adolescent dating or romantic relationships. *Violence and Victims, 18*, 279-297.
- Haugaard, J.L., & 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*, 37-54.
- Hay, C. (2001). Parenting, self-control, and delinquency: A test of self-control theory. *Criminology, 39*, 707-736.
- Hawaii Rev. Stat. § 711-1106 (1992).
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 511-524.
- Holmes, R.M. (1993). Stalking in America: Types and methods of criminal stalkers. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 9*, 317-327.
- Idaho Code § 18-7905 (1992).
- Illinois III Ann. Stat. Ch. 720, para. 5/12-7.3 (1992).
- Indiana Code § 35-45-10-5 (1993).
- Kentucky Rev. Stat. Ann. § 508.130-.150 (1992).
- Kienlen, K.K., Birmingham, D.L., Solberg, K.B., O'Regan, J.T., & Meloy, J.R. (1997). A comparative study of psychotic and non-psychotic stalking. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry & the Law, 25*, 317-334.
- Kienlen, K.K. (1998). Developmental and social antecedents of stalking. In J.R. Meloy (Ed.), *The psychology of stalking: Clinical and forensic perspectives* (pp. 51-67). San Diego, CA: Academic Press, Harcourt Brace & Company, Publishers.
- Kurt, J.L. (1995). Stalking as a variant of domestic violence. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law, 23*, 219-230.
- LaGrange, T.C., & Silverman, R.A. (1999). Low self-control and opportunity: Testing the general theory of crime as an explanation for gender differences in delinquency. *Criminology, 37*, 41-72.
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Palarea, R.E., Cohen, J., & Rohling, M.L. (2000). Breaking up is hard to do: Unwanted pursuit behaviors following the dissolution of a romantic relationship. *Violence and Victims, 15*, 73-90.

- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., & Rohling, M. (2000). Negative family-of-origin experiences: Are they associated with perpetrating unwanted pursuit behaviors? *Violence and Victims, 15*, 459-471.
- Logan, T.K., Nigoff, A., Walker, R., & Jordon, C. (2002). Stalker profiles with and without protective orders: Reoffending or criminal justice processing? *Violence and Victims, 17*, 541-553.
- Logan, T.K., Leukefeld, C., & Walker, B. (2000). Stalking as a variant of intimate violence: Implications from a young adult sample. *Violence and Victims, 15*, 91-111.
- Longshore, D., Chang, E., & Messina, N. (2005). Self-control and social bonds: A combined control perspective on juvenile offending. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 21*, 419-437.
- Louisiana Rev. Stat. Ann. § 14:40.2 (1992).
- Maine Rev. Stat. Ann. 17-A § 210 (1993).
- McCreedy, K., & Dennis, B. (1996). Sex related offenses and fear of crime on campus. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 12*, 69-80.
- Meloy, J.R. (1996). Stalking (obsessional following): A review of some preliminary studies. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 1*, 147-162.
- Meloy, J.R. (1998). *The psychology of stalking: Clinical and forensic perspectives*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Meloy, J.R. (1999). Stalking: an old behavior, a new crime. *Forensic Psychiatry, 22*, 85-99.
- Meloy, J.R., & Gothard, S. (1995). A demographic and clinical comparison of obsessional followers and offenders with mental disorders. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 152*, 256-263.
- Melton, H.C. (2000). Stalking: A review of the literature and direction for the future. *Criminal Justice Review, 25*, 246-262.
- Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary 11th edition. (2003). Merriam-Webster, Incorporated pp. 1215.
- Messman-Moore, T.L., & Long, P.J. (2000). Child sexual abuse and revictimization in the form of adult sexual abuse, adult physical abuse, and adult psychological maltreatment. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15*, 489-502.
- Michigan Stat. Ann. 28.643(8), Mich. Comp. Laws Ann. § 750.411h (1993).

- Minnesota Stat. Ann. § 609.749 (1993).
- Mississippi Code Ann. § 97-3-107 (1992).
- Missouri Ann. Stat. § 565.225 (1993).
- Morcelli, C., & Tremblay, P. (2004). Criminal achievements, offender networks, and the benefits of low self-control. *Criminology*, 42, 773-804.
- Mullen, P.E., Pathè, M., Murdell, R., Stuart, G.W. (1999). Study of stalkers. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 156, 1244-1249.
- Mustaine, E.E., & Tewksbury, R. (1999). A routine activity theory explanation for women's stalking victimizations. *Violence Against Women*, 5, 43-62.
- National Institute of Justice. (1993). *Project to develop a model anti-stalking code states* (Publication No. NCJ 144477). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- National Institute of Justice. (1996, April). *Domestic violence, stalking, and antistalking legislation: An annual report to Congress under the Violence Against Women Act*. Washington, DC: Author.
- New Jersey Stat Ann. § 2C:12-10 (1993).
- New Mexico Stat. Ann. § 30-3A3 (1993).
- North Carolina Gen. Stat. § 14-277.3 (1993).
- O'Keefe, M. (1994). Linking marital-violence, mother-child/father-child aggression, and child behavior problems. *Journal of Family Violence*, 9, 63-78.
- Oklahoma Stat. Ann. Tit. 21, § 1173 (1992).
- Parrott, D.J., & Zeichner, A. (2003). Effects of trait anger and negative attitudes toward women on physical assault in dating relationships. *Journal of Family Violence*, 18, 301-307.
- Pathè, M., & Mullen, P.E. (1997). The impact of stalkers on their victims. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 170, 12-17.
- Patternoster, R., & Brame, R. (2000). On the association among self-control, crime, and analogous behaviors. *Criminology*, 38, 971-982.
- Perez, C. (1993). Stalking: When does obsession become a crime? *American Journal of Criminal Law*, 20, 263-280.
- Phillips, L., Quirk, R., Rosenfeld, B., & O'Connor, M. (2004). Is it stalking? Perceptions of stalking among college undergraduates. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 31, 73-96.

- Piquero, A.R., MacIntosh, R., & Hickman, M. (2000). Does self-control affect survey response? Applying exploratory, confirmatory, and item response theory analysis to Grasmick et al.'s self-control scale. *Criminology*, *38*, 897-930.
- Piquero, A.R., Gomez-Smith, Z., & Langton, L. (2004). Discerning unfairness where others may not: Low self-control and unfair sanction perceptions. *Criminology*, *42*, 699-733.
- Piquero, A.R., MacDonald, J., Dobrin, A., Daigle, L.E., & Cullen, F.T. (2005). Self-control, violent offending, and homicide victimization: Assessing the general theory of crime. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *21*, 55-71.
- Pratt, T.C., & Cullen, F.T. (2000). The empirical status of Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory of crime: A meta-analysis. *Criminology*, *38*, 931-964.
- Rosenfeld, B. (2004). Violence risk factors in stalking and obsessional harassment: A review and preliminary meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *31*, 9-36.
- Sampson, R.J., & Lauritsen, J.L. (1990). Deviant lifestyles, proximity to crime, and the offender-victim link in personal violence. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *27*, 110-139.
- Schreck, C.J. (1999). Criminal victimization and low self-control: An extension and test of a general theory of crime. *Justice Quarterly*, *16*, 633-654.
- Schwartz-Watts, D., & Morgan, D.W. (1998). Violent versus nonviolent stalkers. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, *26*, 241-245.
- Sellers, C. (1999). Self-control and intimate violence: An examination of the scope and specification of the general theory of crime. *Criminology*, *37*, 375-404.
- Sheridan, L., Davies, G., & Boon, J. (2001). The course and nature of stalking: A victim perspective. *The Howard Journal*, *40*, 215-234.
- Sheridan, L., Gillett, R., & Davies, G. (2002). Perceptions and prevalence of stalking in a male sample. *Psychology, Crime and Law*, *8*, 289-310.
- Sheridan, L., Gillett, R., Davies, G.M., Blaauw, E., & Patel, D. (2003). "There's no smoke without fire": Are male ex-partners perceived as more "entitled" to stalk than acquaintance or stranger stalkers? *British Journal of Psychology*, *94*, 87-98.
- Sherman, P.J., & Spence, J.T. (1997). A comparison of two cohorts of college students in responses to the male-female relations questionnaire. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *21*, 265-278.
- Simpson, S.S., & Piquero, N.L. (2002). Low Self-Control, Organizational Theory, and Corporate Crime. *Law & Society Review*, *36*, 509-549.

- Sinclair, H.C., & Frieze, I.H. (2000). Initial courtship behavior and stalking: How should we draw the line? *Violence and Victims, 15*, 23-40.
- South Dakota Codified Laws Ann. § 22-19A-1 to -7 (1992).
- Spence, J.T., & Hahn, E.D. (1997). The attitudes toward women scale and attitude change in college students. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*, 17-34.
- Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1973). A short version of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS). *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 2*, 219-220.
- Spitzberg, B.H., & Cupach, W.R. (2003). What mad pursuit? Obsessive relational intrusion and stalking related phenomena. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 8*, 345-375.
- Spitzberg, B.H., & Rhea, J. (1999). Obsessive relational intrusion and sexual coercion victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14*, 3-20.
- Straus, M.A. & Hamby, S.L. (1995). *Measuring physical and psychological maltreatment of children with the Conflict Tactics Scale*. Durham, NH. University of New Hampshire.
- Stewart, E.A., Elifson, K.W., & Sterk, C.E. (2004). Integrating the General Theory of Crime into an exploration of violent victimization among female offenders. *Justice Quarterly, 21*, 159-181.
- Sutherland, E. (1939). *Principles of criminology*. Philadelphia: Lippincott.
- Title IV of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, Public Law 103-322.
- Tittle, C.R., Ward, D.A., & Grasmick, H.G. (2003). Gender, age, and crime/deviance: A challenge to self-control theory. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 40*, 426-453.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1998). Stalking in America: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey (Special Report No. NCJ 1669592). National Institute of Justice, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Tjaden, P., Thoennes, N., & Allison, C.J. (2000). Comparing stalking victimization from legal and victim perspectives. *Violence and Victims, 15*, 7-22.
- Turner, M.G., & Piquero, A.R. (2002). The stability of self-control. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 30*, 457-471.
- Utah Code Ann. § 76-5-106.5 (1992).

West Virginia Code § 61-2-9a (1992).

White, J., Kowalski, R.M., Lyndon, A., & Valentine, S. (2000). An integrative contextual developmental model of male stalking. *Violence and Victims, 15*, 373-388.

Wright, J.P., & Beaver, K.M. (2005). Do parents matter in creating self-control in their children? A genetically informed test of Gottfredson and Hirschi's theory of low self-control. *Criminology, 43*, 1169-1202.

Wright, J.A., Burgess, A.G., Burgess, A.W., Laszlo, A.T, McCrary, G.O., & Douglas, J.E. (1996). A typology of interpersonal stalking. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 11*, 487-502.

Wright, B.R.E., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T.E., & Silva, P.A. (1999). Low self-control, social bonds, and crime: Social causation, social selection, or both? *Criminology, 37*, 479-514.

Zona, M.A., Palarea, R.E., & Lane, J.C. (1998). Psychiatric diagnosis and the offender-victim typology of stalking. In J.R. Meloy (Ed.), *The psychology of stalking: Clinical and forensic perspectives* (pp. 69-84). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Kathleen A. Fox earned her Bachelor of Science degree in sociology in 2004 from the University of Utah. She moved to Gainesville, Florida to enter the graduate program in the Department of Criminology, Law, and Society at the University of Florida in the fall of 2004 where she earned her Master of Arts degree in 2006.