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This study examined victim characteristics as predictors of stalking victimization. Female college students (N=217) completed scales assessing the following constructs: stalking victimization, alexithymia, alcohol abuse, assertiveness, hyperfemininity, agreeableness, and dependent personality disorder. The results revealed significant negative correlations between stalking victimization and both alexithymia and agreeableness. There were significant positive correlations between stalking victimization with drinking problems and hyperfemininity. Agreeableness was found to contribute a unique portion of variance above alexithymia and drinking problems. No significant relationship was found between stalking victimization and assertiveness or dependent personality characteristics. The findings with respect to drinking problems, hyperfemininity, agreeableness, and alexithymia represent novel contributions to this research area that should be further explored in future studies.
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INTRODUCTION

Stalking has several negative ramifications for its victims. For instance, nearly half of identified stalking victims in a study conducted by Amar (2006) reported significant changes in their behaviors and routines in response to being stalked. Of these same identified stalking victims, 13 percent reported being physically abused by their stalker (Amar, 2006). A study conducted by Blackburn (1999) paints a similar, but more devastating, picture of the aftermath of stalking. In this study, it was found that 46 percent of identified stalking victims were threatened by their stalker, and of these threats, 22.8 percent of them were acted upon (Blackburn, 1999). Of these same identified stalking victims, 26.5 percent experienced property damage by their stalker (Blackburn, 1999). Disturbingly, 18 percent of identified stalking victims became suicidal as a direct result of being stalked, and 7.2 percent of these victims went on to make a suicide attempt (Blackburn, 1999). Blackburn (1999) also found 15 percent of these stalking victims qualified for the diagnosis of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder.

There were several negative mental and physical health symptoms associated with a history of being stalked found in a study conducted by Davis, Coker, and Sanderson (2002). Stalking victims, of both genders, were found to be more likely to develop physical health problems when feelings of fear developed from the stalking incident. It is important to note that the same study also found women to be 13 times
more likely than men to report being afraid of their stalker (Davis et al., 2002). In both men and women, being stalked was significantly associated with depression and the use of tranquilizers or recreational drugs (Davis et al., 2002).

Because of the severity of these detrimental experiences upon victims, it is imperative to identify which women may be at risk for becoming a victim of stalking so that prevention can eventually be designed to help these women. Thus, the proposed study seeks to identify possible risk factors. The remainder of the introduction will summarize definitions and types of stalking, characteristics of stalkers, and factors related to stalker violence. Based on the domestic violence literature, possible risk factors for becoming a victim of stalking violence will be discussed. Finally, a study designed to test these hypotheses will be proposed.

Stalking is typically defined by legal terms set by anti-stalking laws. California was the first state to incorporate anti-stalking laws in 1990 (Hunzeker, 1992, as cited in Tjaden, Thoennes & Allison, 2000). Its legal definition of “Any person who willfully, maliciously, and repeatedly follows or willfully and maliciously harasses another person and who makes a credible threat with the intent to place that person in reasonable fear for his or her safety, or the safety of his or her immediate family is guilty of the crime of stalking…” (California Penal Code, Section § 646.9, 2006) is used as a guideline to define stalking in research.

A variety of prevalence rates of stalking have been collected in recent years. A national survey of stalking conducted by Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) found that in the United States females were more likely to be the victims and males more likely to be the perpetrators. This finding is contradicted only when the type of stalking is cyberstalking,
which is where the unwanted pursuit behavior occurs over the internet. Under this scenario, males are the more likely to be the stalking victim (Alexy, Burgess, Baker, & Smoyak, 2005). Other characteristics of stalking found by Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) were that 52% of victims were between 18-29 years old, the average time stalked was 1.8 years, and 81% of women stalked were stalked by a former romantic partner.

**Stalking Definition and Type**

Reliance on anti-stalking laws can cause problems in arriving at a consensus for the definition of stalking because there are many variations of these laws from state to state. The type of definition used is very important in stalking research, because it can affect the observed prevalence rates. Tjaden, Thoennes, and Allison (2000) compared a legal definition of stalking and a victim’s perspective definition of stalking on prevalence rates and found that the victim’s perspective definition resulted in a higher prevalence rate than the legal definition. The legal definition required the stalking victim to report fear, that the stalking behavior occurred more than once, and to affirm behaviorally specific screening questions (i.e., has anyone followed or spied on you?, Did you receive unsolicited phone calls or emails?, etc.). Victim perspective definition used direct questions containing the word “stalked” (e.g., Have you ever been stalked?) However, it was also found that there was a fairly high convergence rate between the two definitions (Tjaden, Thoennes, & Allison, 2000) in that a significant number of victims’ definitions of stalking qualified for the legal definition of stalking.

Society’s present perception of what constitutes stalking can also influence how stalking is defined. Phillips, Quirk, Rosenfeld, and Connor (2004) found that both male and female college undergraduates were more likely to assign the label of “stalking”
when the following conditions were met: the perpetrator was male, there was no prior relationship between stalker and victim, and the stalking behavior was severe. Kinkade, Burns, and Fuentes (2005) found undergraduates to more likely to ascribe “stalking” under certain conditions for the victim and the stalker. In regards to the victim, the conditions were: low socioeconomic status, unwanted gifts from the stalker, no physical abuse history, and no chemical dependency. For the stalker, low socioeconomic status, and collecting information about the victim. Previous experience of stalking also influences whether or not the “stalking” label is ascribed to a scenario (Yanowitz, 2006). Men who either were previously stalked or knew of someone who had been stalked were more likely to label a mild stalking scenario as stalking than men who did not have such experiences (Yanowitz, 2006). However, for women, prior stalking history did not significantly influence whether or not they rated a scenario as “stalking” (Yanowitz, 2006). As these results indicate, the definition of stalking is variable and may be slanted towards blaming the stalking victim.

Stalking has been divided into four definitive subcategories: celebrity stalking, stranger or acquaintance stalking, cyberstalking, and intimate partner stalking. Celebrity stalking is where the victim being stalked is a celebrity, which is close to stranger or acquaintance stalking where little or nothing is truly known about the victim before the onset of the stalking behavior. Cyberstalking is a fairly new phenomenon developing alongside the advancement in communication technology. This type of stalking is defined as using the internet to gain information about the victim, and using it to post messages to intimidate and harass the victim (Alexy et al., 2005). Intimate partner stalking a relationship between perpetrator and victim prior to the onset of the stalking behavior.
Given that the majority of stalking victims are stalked by former intimate partners (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998), the focus of the present study is on this subcategory of stalking. It is also the subcategory of stalking that lends itself to the possibility that victims may inadvertently engage in some behaviors that make the stalking more likely to occur or to be sustained.

**Characteristics of Stalkers**

While some statistics have been collected on the victims of stalking, a greater wealth of knowledge has been acquired on the attributes of the stalker. These attributes have been identified and separated into the three main categories of biological factors, psychological factors, and family background factors. Each will be discussed in turn in this section.

**Biological Factors.** In terms of biological factors, gender differences on the motivation and behaviors of the stalker have been found (Purcell, Pathe, & Mullen, 2001). Unlike their male counterparts, female stalkers have been motivated by a desire to establish intimacy with their victims (professional contacts and women), and are more likely to harass their victims with phone calls (Kamphuis, Emmelkamp, & De Vries, 2004). Male stalkers were more likely than their female counterparts to have higher rates of drug abuse, harass strangers, follow their victims, and have a broader range of motivation behind their stalking behavior (Kamphuis et al., 2004). There was also a gender difference of stalker frequency, with male stalkers outnumbering female stalkers four to one (Kamphuis et al., 2004). These results indicate that different stalking intervention programs may need to be put in place in accordance with the gender of the stalker.
Additional biological factors of frontal lobe deficits have been found in relation to domestic violence (Corvo, Halpern, & Ferraro, 2006; Westby & Ferraro, 1999), a type of violence that is often associated with stalking (Coleman, 1997). Westby and Ferraro (1999) found that, in a task requiring the subject to inhibit competing responses while under time restraint, that male domestic violence batterers did significantly poorer on this task than men that were not batterers. Corvo et al., (2006) took the data from the aforementioned study’s data for secondary analysis. They found that level of battering is associated with frontal lobe deficits (Corvo et al., 2006). For men, high scores of battering had significant association with frontal lobe deficits; however, low scores in violence had no significant association with frontal lobe deficits (Corvo et al., 2006). This leads to the conclusion that batterers on the severe end of the domestic violence spectrum suffer from more frontal lobe deficits than the average man.

**Psychological Factors.** Several psychological attributes have been identified to be associated with the stalker. Tonin (2004) assessed child and adult attachment style of three groups. The first two groups consisted of people detained under the Mental Health Act (Tonin, 2004) with one being detained for stalking (stalking group) and one for other reasons (forensic control group) (Tonin, 2004). The third group was a community control group consisting of randomly selected people from the community (Tonin, 2004). Tonin (2004) found that compared to both control groups of non-stalking individuals, stalkers were more likely to possess an insecure adult attachment style. Further analysis of the stalking group revealed that fixated (i.e., stalking of one person because of infatuation) stalkers were significantly higher in preoccupied attachment than serial stalkers (i.e., stalking several women with the goal of sexual contact) (Tonin, 2004). A preoccupied
attachment style is characterized by a negative view of self and a positive view of others (Dutton & Winstead, 2006).

Kamphuis et al., (2004) found male stalkers to be low on agreeableness, relatively low on emotional stability, and relatively low on conscientiousness (Kamphuis et al., 2004). They also found this sample of male stalkers to be insecurely attached, to be moderately functional people, and to be strongly sensitive to issues revolving around rejection and loss (Kamphuis et al., 2004). Dennison and Stewart (2006) found that both male and females who had ruminations about their love interest (i.e., constantly thinking about the person) were more likely to engage in covert pursuit behaviors (i.e., they made no attempt to directly communicate with the person being pursued).

Different types of control are sometimes implemented in the process of stalking. These types of control include financial, social, psychological, physical, and sexual control (Brewster, 2003). In a sample of women who were stalked by their former romantic partners, Brewster (2003) found that 98.9 percent experienced psychological control (i.e., manipulating partner using guilt, fear, and shame), 68.4 percent experienced social control, 46 percent experienced physical control (i.e., punching, pushing, slapping, and shoving), 27.3 percent experienced financial control (i.e., restricting knowledge of finances, denying use of debit/credit cards and checks, and denying partner to earn money outside of home), and 1.1 percent experienced sexual control (i.e., forced sex). Taken together, these results support the conclusion that stalkers have problems in the areas of attachment and affect regulation and may be trying to compensate for these problems by imposing control over their stalking victims.
**Family Factors.** Negative family experiences also have been linked to unwanted pursuit behaviors (UPB) (Langhinrichsen-Rohling & Rohlin, 2000). When male and female college students were both examined for engaging in UPB, specific negative family of origin experiences were associated with UPB for each gender (Langhinrichsen-Rohling & Rohlin, 2000). For males, having a background where the parents were either divorced or separated was significantly linked to UPB (Langhinrichsen-Rohling & Rohlin, 2000). For females, a background where the parents had threatening and intense arguments with each other was strongly associated with UPB (Langhinrichsen-Rohling & Rohlin, 2000).

Specific characteristics of fathers have also been found to be associated with stalking behavior (Tonin, 2004). Tonin (2004) found that incarcerated stalkers were more likely to report having had an overprotective father in comparison to inmates convicted of non-stalking offenses. However, there was no significant difference in the stalking and non-stalking inmates on father’s level of care, mother’s level of care, or mother’s level of protectiveness. As a whole, these results indicate that an unstable or overprotective parental relationship may somehow contribute to the development of stalking behavior.

**Factors Related to Stalker Violence**

Stalking behavior can escalate to perpetrating violent behaviors against the victims of stalking (Roberts, 2005; Rosenfeld, 2004). In a meta-analysis by Rosenfeld (2004), it was found that a previous intimate relationship with the victim, a history of violent behavior, a history of drug abuse, and making threats were all associated with violence during the course of stalking. Research examining exclusively college females who identified themselves as victims of stalking by a former intimate partner has found
that 35.9 percent of them reported being physically abused by their stalker (Roberts, 2005). A regression analysis revealed that violent threats by their former partner, drug abuse by their former partner, and their former partner’s jealousy of the victim’s relationship with others were all found to be significantly related to stalker violence (Roberts, 2005).

Stalking violence does not stop at just physical violence, but has also been known to take on a form of sexual coercion as well (Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999). When male and female college students were assessed for having been a victim of obsessive relational intrusion, they found obsessive relational intrusion to be significantly associated with four types of sexual coercion (Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999). The four types of sexual coercion were psychological coercion, severe force, mild force, and deception (Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999). Psychological coercion was defined as “reflecting verbal persuasion, undressing without permission, verbal pressure, whining and begging, and other relatively symbolic means of influence” (Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999). Severe force was defined as “reflecting the use of a weapon, beating, injury, and choking” (Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999). Mild force was defined as “physically forced, pinned down, twisted arm, threatened to hurt, and so forth” (Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999). Deception was defined as “lied, falsely professed love, and said things they didn’t mean” (Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999). Psychological aggression by either a male or female intimate partner has been found to be significantly related to sexual aggression by the intimate partner (Ramisetty-Mikler, Caetano, & McGrath, 2007). These results indicate that victims of stalking face serious risk to their physical safety, and that stalking is not just merely a nuisance on the privacy of others. In view of the research pointing to the many negative effects on the stalking victim’s mental and
physical health, as well as the victim’s potential for being physically or sexually abused, it is of great importance to identify women who are at risk for being stalked. Doing so can enable primary and secondary prevention of stalking and its associated deleterious effects upon its victims.

**Possible Characteristics of Stalking Victims**

In the view of the relative dearth of research on characteristics of stalking victims, a reliance on domestic abuse victimization research will be used to speculate about the possible profile of victims of stalking. This was deemed a fair comparison due to the research indicating that women who had experienced domestic violence are often stalked by their former partner (Coleman, 1997). Specifically, Brewster (2003) found that 75 percent of female stalking victims experienced control issues in their previous relationship with the stalker. Additionally commonalities have been identified between stalkers and batterers (Douglas & Dutton, 2001). Douglas and Dutton (2001) found that both batterers and stalkers experienced rage reactions to perceived or actual rejection or abandonment, and they both displayed Cluster B personality disorder traits (i.e., primitive defenses, weak ego strength, emotional volatility, attachment dysfunction, and early childhood trauma). Specifically, former partner stalkers have been found to exhibit social control (i.e., restricted contact with family and/or friends, jealousy of social interactions made in public, monitoring and/or restricting phone calls) during prior the relationship and stalking behaviors at the end of the relationship (Brewster, 2003).

It is estimated that 22 percent of women experienced sexual violence during their prior romantic relationship with their stalker (Roberts, 2005). Because of the co-occurrence of these three forms of victimization against women (i.e., stalking, domestic
violence, and rape), it was decided that research on traits of rape victims would also be useful in devising hypotheses regarding possible characteristics of stalking victims. For each proposed characteristic addressed in the following sections, research on domestic violence will be discussed first, and then research on rape will be discussed. If available, research on stalking or revictimization and the variable in question will also be covered as well.

**Childhood Abuse.** Childhood abuse research will be discussed due to a lack of stalking victimization research. Research overwhelmingly demonstrates an increased risk for domestic violence and rape when the woman has a prior abuse history in childhood (Schumacher, Feldbau-Kohn, Slep, & Heyman, 2000; Seedat, Murray, & Forde, 2005; Whitfield, Anda, Dube, & Felitti, 2003). This phenomenon of being abused in childhood and then again in adulthood is known as revictimization. There are several forms of childhood abuse (physical, sexual, emotional, and verbal) that have been significantly linked to an increase in risk for later abuse in the form of domestic violence or rape (Schumacher et al., 2000; Seedat et al., 2005; Whitfield et al., 2003).

**Domestic Violence.** Domestic violence research has been used due to a lack of stalking victimization research. Domestic violence (physical abuse towards spouse or significant person) risk is increased when the woman has a previous history of childhood physical abuse (Seedat et al., 2005; Whitfield et al., 2003). Risk for domestic abuse (encompassing all forms of abuse such as financial, physical, psychological, etc.) during adulthood has been found to be significantly increased with a prior history of childhood sexual abuse (Seedat et al., 2005; Whitfield et al., 2003). Messman-Moore and Long (2000) found that childhood sexual abuse to be significantly associated with later sexual,
physical, and psychological abuse in adulthood. Schumacher et al., (2000) found that emotional and verbal childhood abuse were also significant risk factors for male to female domestic abuse. Childhood abuse also is associated with factors that influence the woman to stay in a domestic violence situation (Andrews & Brewin, 1990; Griffing, Ragin, Morrison, Sage, Madry, & Primm, 2005). Andrews and Brewin (1990) found that victims of domestic violence with a history of childhood abuse were more likely to have characterological self-blame (i.e., blaming the traits of self) than behavior self-blame (i.e., blaming the actions of self) when living with the abusive partner. When victims are able to leave the abusive partner, victims with a history of childhood sexual abuse are more likely to underestimate the risks of returning to the abusive spouse (Griffing et al., 2005). Taken together, these results suggest that there is a significant association between a prior abuse history and risk of later abuse in domestic violence. Once again, since domestic abuse victims a higher risk of being stalked by their former spouses (Coleman, 1997), these results will be used to establish that prior relationship (spouse, friends, acquaintance, etc.) between stalker and victim needs to be examined to see how it affects stalking victimization risk.

Rape. Sexual victimization research has been used due to a lack of stalking victimization research. Research has also found that physical assault during adolescence is associated with a greater risk of sexual victimization during freshman year of college (Smith et al., 2003). In a study by Smith et al., (2003), being sexually assaulted was also more likely the same year of being physically assaulted (Smith et al., 2003). A meta-analysis of sexual revictimization research found that there is a moderate relationship (D = .59) between childhood sexual abuse and the later occurrence of adult sexual abuse.
(Roodman & Clum, 2001). Messman-Moore and Long (2000) found childhood sexual abuse to be significantly associated with later sexual, physical, and psychological abuse in adulthood. Childhood sexual abuse was found to play a significant role in later adolescent sexual abuse if the woman was either able to recall childhood sexual abuse, or was uncertain if childhood sexual abuse had occurred (Krahe, Scheinberger-Olwig, Waizenhofer, & Kolpein, 1999). Taken together, the research suggests there is an association between childhood sexual abuse and later adult sexual revictimization, adult physical abuse, and adult psychological abuse.

Stalking. Coleman (1997) also found that women that experienced physical assault during the course of a romantic relationship, defined as either living with the partner or married, significantly increased the risk of stalking occurring after the relationship was ended. In a study by Blackburn (1999), a prior physical and sexual abuse history as a child and as an adult was significantly associated with women identifying themselves as a victim of stalking. Physical and sexual abuse was assessed in stalking and non-stalking victims at two age periods, before and after the age of sixteen (Blackburn, 1999). With respect to physical abuse stalking victims were found to be more likely than non-stalking victims to have a history of both childhood and adult physical abuse (Blackburn, 1999). In regards to sexual abuse stalking victims were found to be more likely than non-stalking victims to have a history of childhood sexual abuse and adult sexual victimization (Blackburn, 1999).

Dependency and Hyperfemininity

Domestic violence. In an effort to identify risk factors for domestic violence, dependency was researched, and has been associated with domestic violence (Bornstein,
Bornstein (2006) conducted a meta-analysis on studies of dependency and abuse and found several studies indicating that dependent characteristics of both victim and the perpetrator increase the likelihood of domestic violence. The results of these studies suggest that economic dependency of the victim and emotional dependency of the perpetrator were independently associated with the likelihood of physical abuse occurring in a relationship (Bornstein, 2006). Research results also supported economic dependency as a significant factor influencing the inability of victims to leave an abusive relationship (Bornstein, 2006). Further, dependency type has been found to determine the level of severity of domestic violence (Kalmus & Straus, 1982). Kalmus and Straus (1982) found that subjective dependency of the wife (i.e., how the wife perceived her level of dependency) was associated with minor physical violence (i.e., no risk of serious injury), and that objective dependency (i.e., economic dependency) was associated with severe physical violence (i.e., risk of serious injury). In addition, a study by Bornstein (2005) indicates that childhood sexual abuse is associated with interpersonal dependency in early adulthood, and that economic dependency is associated with severe forms of domestic abuse. Childhood sexual abuse may influence later interpersonal dependency by instilling within a child a sense of constant vulnerability possibly created by being violated by a primary caregiver. Since dependency increases the risk of domestic abuse, and domestic abuse victims are at risk for stalking (Coleman, 1997), dependency was examined as a possible risk factor for stalking victimization.

Another relationship factor that has been examined with respect to the domestic violence literature is how gender roles are defined in a relationship and how these roles influence the dynamics of a relationship. Hyperfemininity has been defined as
subscribing to an exaggerated stereotypical feminine gender role, to a belief that success is obtained through relationships with men, and to a belief that sexuality needs to be used in attainment of these relationships (Murnen & Byrne, 1991). Traditional feminine roles are defined as subscribing to the belief that women should be subordinate to men (Harris et al., 2005). Hyperfemininity and traditional feminine roles, concepts closely related to dependency, also have been found to put women at an increased likelihood for entering into and remaining in abusive relationships (Maybach & Gold, 1994; Harris et al., 2005). Maybach and Gold (1994) found that women high in hyperfemininity were more attracted to “Macho-men” (i.e., men who are action oriented, risk-takers, had quick tempers, and were slow in revealing emotions) as potential partners than women low in hyperfemininity. Research also indicates that women who are identified as having more traditional feminine gender roles, in comparison to women who were identified as having less traditional feminine role, are significantly less likely to report spousal abuse (Harris et al., 2005).

_**Stalking.**_ Blackburn (1999) hypothesized hyperfemininity to be associated with an increased risk of stalking due to previous research finding that hyperfeminine women are more likely to rationalize sexually coercive vignettes and to be more attracted to “Macho-men.” Blackburn (1999) found hyperfemininity was not significantly associated with stalking victimization. However, Blackburn (1999) acknowledges limitations of the hyperfemininity measure, which only assessed over-exaggerated negative feminine traits that are displayed only when in relationships with men and neglecting possible positive, exaggerated feminine traits. In general, Blackburn (1999) acknowledged that hyperfemininity was ill-defined in this measure. In summary, some studies suggest that
women who score high on measures of hyperfemininity and traditional feminine roles are at an increased risk for domestic violence and a decreased likelihood of reporting abuse.

**Substance Abuse**

*Domestic violence.* In addition to dependency and hyperfemininity, alcohol and drug abuse have both been found to increase the risk of domestic violence for women (Jewkes, Levin, Penn-Kekana, 2002; Seedat et al., 2005). Seedat et al., (2005) conducted a phone survey of women in the Memphis, Tennessee area and found greater prevalence of domestic violence in women with a prior history of drug abuse. Testa and VanZile-Tamsen (2007) found drug abuse to be significantly associated with later sexual victimization by an intimate partner. Alcohol abuse has also been found to be significantly associated with an increased risk for domestic violence (Jewkes et al., 2002). Seedat et al., (2005) found that women victimized by intimate partner violence were more likely to abuse alcohol than non-abused women. Researchers differ on the reasons for the relationship between alcohol and drug abuse and domestic violence. Alcohol abuse has been posited as being the result and as a possible source of marital conflict in domestic violence situations (Jewkes et al., 2002). However, drug abuse is looked at as only a negative consequence of intimate partner violence, and is not considered as a possible factor in the development of intimate partner violence (Seedat et al., 2005). These results taken together suggest that drug and alcohol abuse are significantly associated with domestic violence, but determining if drug and alcohol abuse are a source of increased marital conflict or a result of domestic violence is still debatable.
**Rape.** Alcohol abuse combined with drug abuse has been found to increase the likelihood of forced sex and the severity of sexual victimization (Molitor, Ruiz, Klausher & McFarland, 2000; Ullman, Karabatsos, & Koss, 1999). Drug abuse disorders among victims of rape have found to be significantly associated with rape by perpetrators who were strangers, acquaintances, or husbands to the victim (Messman-Moore & Long, 2002). Drug abuse may predict what type of abuse occurs (Feerick et al., 2002). In this study, groups of women with and without cocaine addictions were compared for a history of childhood sexual abuse and adult victimization (Feerick et al., 2002). The results indicated that women with cocaine addiction and a history of childhood sexual abuse were significantly more likely to be sexually victimized as adults, and women without a cocaine addiction but with childhood sexual abuse were found to have a significantly greater likelihood of being the victim and perpetrator of physical violence in intimate relationships (Feerick et al., 2002). There are two possible explanations given for the connection between alcohol and drug abuse with rape. The first is that intoxication from either source can lower inhibitions and decrease normal precautionary behaviors (Moliter et al., 2000). The second is that the alcohol and drug abuse are a negative effect of being raped (Moliter et al., 2000). On the other hand, Feerick et al., (2002) posited that different types of prior maltreatment (i.e., sexual abuse and physical abuse) during childhood may be more essential predictors of violence during adulthood for different subgroups of women. Maltreatment such as physical abuse during childhood may be an indirect predictor of risky behaviors in adulthood (i.e., drug abuse). In conclusion, these results suggest that alcohol and drug abuse to be significantly associated with the experience of sexual abuse in adulthood.
Alexithymia

**Rape.** Prior research has not yet demonstrated an association between alexithymia and domestic violence, but has found a significant association between alexithymia and rape, as well as other forms of sexual victimization. Alexithymia is defined as “deficits in the cognitive-experiential domain of emotion response systems, and at the level of interpersonal regulation of emotion” (Taylor, 2000). That is, persons with alexithymia possess difficulties labeling and fully experiencing emotions (Taylor, 2000). Research suggest that rape victims are more likely to be alexithymic than non-rape victims, and victims of multiple rapes were found to be even more alexithymic than victims of single rapes (Zeitline, McNally, & Cassiday 1993). Alexithymia has been posited as a possible coping mechanism to trauma by protecting against severely painful affect (Zeitline et al., 1993). Zeitline et al., (1993) concluded from their research results that this possible coping mechanism may not develop from a single incident of trauma, but from the stress of repeated exposure to trauma. Scher and Twaite (1999) posited that repeated incidents of abuse may cause the victim to “turn off” their affective responses to escape from some of the pain. Cloitre, Scarvalone, and Difede (1997) hypothesize that alexithymic women are more susceptible to abuse due to the fact they cannot interpret internal emotional states, which leaves them without the benefit of internal “danger signals” when threatening stimuli is present in their environment.

**Childhood abuse.** As stated previously, due to the lack of research on stalking, I will draw upon information on other types of abuse to guide the hypotheses in the current study. Prior sexual abuse as a child has been found to be associated with the development of alexithymia (Hund & Espelage, 2005). Research on sexual
revictimization has found that women who were sexually abused as a child and revictimized in adulthood were significantly more likely to be alexithymic than women who were not sexually revictimized (Cloitre et al., 1997; Scher & Twaite, 1999). Scher and Twaite (1999) found that there was a significantly higher occurrence of alexithymia in victims of childhood sexual abuse than women without an abuse history. In a study by Hund and Espelage (2005), 608 undergraduate and graduate women were given scales measuring: childhood sexual abuse, general distress, alexithymia, and eating disordered behaviors. Analysis of these scales supported a structural model such that childhood sexual abuse was associated with general distress, which was in turn associated with alexithymia. Finally, alexithymia was predictive of eating disordered behaviors (Hund & Espelage, 2005).

Physically abused children have also been found to have signs of alexithymia (During & McMahon, 1991). A study by During and McMahon (1991) examined levels of alexithymia in a control sample of mothers and children with and without previous charges of child abuse. The mothers and children of both groups were then shown pictures of both adults and children with facial expressions (During & McMahon, 1991). The results indicated a deficiency in abused children’s ability to identify emotions for the pictures of children in comparison to the non-abused group of children (During & McMahon, 1991). There were no significant differences between the abusive mothers and non-abusive mothers in their abilities to determine emotions in the pictures (During & McMahon, 1991). Severity of emotional and physical neglect in childhood has also been associated with the severity of alexithymic symptoms (Zlotnick, Mattia, & Zimmerman, 2001). Alexithymia has also been found to mediate the relationship between a reported
history of childhood maltreatment and self-injurious behaviors (Pavio & McCulloch, 2004). In essence, this means that a previous childhood abuse combined with the inability to express painful emotions related to the abuse is associated with a greater likelihood of self-injurious behaviors. These results indicate that previous abuse history is associated with alexithymia and that alexithymia mediates the abuse association on self-injurious behaviors. It is possible that previous abuse may serve as a risk factor for stalking by increasing the likelihood of alexithymia.

**Other Hypothesized Characteristics of Stalking Victims.** While little research has been done looking at the association between agreeableness and violence against women, one might theoretically presuppose that these traits might predict who will be a victim of stalking. The possible lack of research on agreeableness to female victimization is a possible bias towards these variables in western culture. A person that is high in agreeableness is typically warm and friendly towards others and is probably well-received and rewarded by western society for such behaviors. Social norms and values do not exclude themselves from researchers, and it is possible that the current lack of research examining agreeableness’ relationship (if any) to female victimization is due to these norms and values.

Agreeableness has been found to have an effect on how people experience anger. Meier, Robinson, and Wilkowski (2006) investigated whether there are different reactions to violent stimuli as a function of dispositional agreeableness. They measured all participants’ level of agreeableness and then primed them with aggressive cues (Robinson & Wilkowski, 2006). They did this through a verbal task where a target word and two words below on each side were presented, and the participants were then asked
to choose a word from the bottom two that was closest to the meaning of the target word (Robinson & Wilkowski, 2006). There were aggressive and non-aggressive target words used, and participants were randomly assigned to either the aggressive priming condition or the neutral condition (Robinson & Wilkowski, 2006). The participants then played a reaction time task where if they won they were able to decide the decibel level of punishment for the non-existent competitor, and the first opportunity for punishment was used to assess participants level of aggression after the word task trial (Robinson & Wilkowski, 2006). Robinson et al., (2006) found that people with a high level of agreeableness experienced no prime effect from aggressive stimuli. In other words, when exposed to aggressive stimuli the participants did not select higher decibels of punishment during the reaction time task. Robinson and colleague posited that this was because people high in agreeableness self-regulated aggressive behaviors by cuing pro-social thoughts when presented aggressive stimuli. Meier and Robinson (2004) found that agreeableness moderated the relationship between blame and reported feelings of anger. In essence, people that are low in agreeableness are more likely to experience anger in association with blame than people high in agreeableness. Taken together, these results suggest that people high in agreeableness tend to have pro-social thoughts in connection to aggressive stimuli and are less likely to experience anger in association with blame. Based on these findings one might speculate that agreeableness is associated with an increased risk of being a victim of stalking by creating a more passive stance toward experiences of violence, and reacting by being helpful and nice in a violent situation rather than being self-protective.
The Current Study

In the current study, I examined alexithymia and alcohol abuse as predictors of being a victim of stalking. While these predictors might mediate the relationship between childhood abuse and adult stalking victimization, I examined potential proximal and not distal causes of stalking victim status. Thus, I examined alexithymia and alcohol abuse as predictors. As discussed previously, it has been hypothesized that alexithymia may serve to protect rape victims from experiencing painful affect (Zietline et al., 1993). Unfortunately, this method of coping has the potential to lead to further victimization (Cloitre et al., 1997). Since alexithymia is an inability to infer internal states as emotions, such emotionality processing difficulties may hinder a woman’s ability to use internal states to detect dangerous situations (Cloitre et al., 1997). Alcohol abuse has been found to be associated with both domestic violence and an increased risk for adult sexual victimization (Jewkes et al., 2002; Moliter et al., 2000). Alcohol abuse has been posited as both a precursor and a coping mechanism to adult victimization (Moliter et al., 2000). It has been theorized that it could be a precursor by decreasing the likelihood of engaging in effective self-protective behaviors (Moliter et al., 2000).

In the current study, I also examined variables that can pertain to a person’s level of power or self-reliance. It is believed that a lack of power or dependency can contribute to whether a person can effectively handle a dangerous situation. A combination of dependency styles of a couple has been found to be attributed to domestic violence (Bornstein, 2006). An economic dependency of the woman and emotional dependency in the man has been found to be associated with physical abuse in the relationship (Bornstein, 2006). Economic dependency of the woman has also been attributed to a
woman’s inability to leave an abusive situation (Bornstein, 2006). Beyond economic dependency, a woman with dependent personality tendencies may be less likely to confront a partner at early stages of leading to the development of stalking for fear of rejection.

Hyperfemininity is another variable posited as a source of diminished personal power. In the current study, it is posited that adhering to stereotypical feminine roles limits the personal power experienced by a woman. Maybach and Gold (1999) found that women high in hyperfemininity to be more likely attracted to “Macho” men and more likely to enter and remain in an abusive relationship. However, Blackburn (1999) did not find hyperfemininity to be associated with stalking victimization, and posited that this may be due to limitations of the scale. Assertiveness is associated with a traditional male sex role (Nix, Lohr, & Mosesso, 1984; Nix, Lohr, & Stauffacher, 1980). Research has also found that low female sex-role stereotyping is associated with high levels of assertiveness (Tolor, Kelly, & Stebbins, 1976). It is theorized in the current study that assertiveness maybe the unique missing piece to the hyperfemininity scale that could be inversely associated with stalking victimization. In summary, the current study examines factors that are expected to diminish personal power, such as high levels of dependency, high levels of hyperfemininity, and low levels of assertiveness.

In the current study, I explored an additional new variable, agreeableness, as a possible predictor variable of stalking victimization. Research has found that people high in agreeableness have more positive thoughts and emotions during aggressive and anger invoking situations (Meier & Robinson, 2004; Robinson & Wilkowski, 2006). In theory, this could also contribute to a stalking victim being less prepared for a negative outcome.
Even if the stalking victim recognizes cues that signify (or can predict) aggressive and/or anger responses, a general aversion to confrontation may prevent the stalking victim from seeking appropriate help and precautions. The hypotheses of the current study all pertaining to stalking victimization among women are as follows:

H1: Alexithymia and alcohol abuse are significantly positively associated with stalking victimization.

H2: Personal power and self-reliance (as represented by lower levels of dependent personality, and hyperfemininity, and higher levels of assertiveness) are negatively associated with stalking victimization.

H3: Agreeableness is positively associated with stalking victimization.

H4: Agreeableness, assertiveness, dependency, and hyperfemininity are predictor of stalking victimization above and beyond alexithymia and alcohol abuse.

H5: Relationship to the stalker (i.e., stranger, acquaintance, former intimate partner) are moderators of the relationship between the predictor variables and stalking behavior. Specifically, the hypothesized predictors in the current study are associated with stalking victimization when the woman knows her stalker, but not when they are strangers.
METHOD

Participants

Female undergraduate participants (N=217) were recruited from a private Midwestern university. The sample size was selected based on the expectation of a medium effect size (d = .50) (Cohen, 1988), and previous research finding that 33% (N = 257) of college students have a history of being stalked (Blackburn, 1999). Participants received course credit for introductory psychology course (N=128), or extra credit for students attending upper level psychology courses. Since the relationship with the stalker is an important factor in this study, upper level psychology courses at the junior (N=51) and senior levels (N=37) were recruited in order to increase the likelihood of such a relationship while attending college. The average age of participants was 20 (SD = 1.29) years. Further, the vast majority of participants were Caucasian (91%); 3% were African-American, 4% were Latinas, and 2% were from other ethnic groups.

Materials and Procedure

Stalking. The Obsessive Relational Intrusion (ORI) scale by Spitzberg and Cupach (1997) was used to measure stalking victimization. The scale measures the stalker’s behavior as viewed from the perspective of the victim (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1997). Aspects of stalking that are measured include the following: the nature of stalker’s behavior, stalker’s level of violence the stalker’s gender, victims’ perceptions, the length
of time of stalking, and the previous relationship with the stalker (if any). The scale consists of 30 items that assess intensity of time of stalking, and the previous relationship with the stalker (if any). The scale consists of 30 items that assess intensity of participant’s stalking (in)experience (i.e., classification as a stalking victim, number of times stalked, number of previous stalkers, etc.). Item 40 in particular was used in analyzing Hypothesis 5 in determining how previous relationship with the stalker may affect predictor variables. The total score for the 30-items on stalking behaviors ranges from 30-150, and this score will be used as the criterion variable in the current study. The item pertaining to the relationship (if any) to the stalker was used to test hypotheses 5. Two items were added to reflect student socialization through Facebook, an online social network, as another possible avenue of stalking behavior. Specifically, gathering information from Facebook to locate the victim, and using Facebook to contact the victim. The ORI was developed with the consultation of an interdisciplinary team of various professionals that deal with the issue of stalking. Previous research has found the ORI items to have a coefficient alpha of .83. Stalking victimization was assessed by asking whether or not the respondent had ever been stalked. Victims of stalking were found to have higher than those who were not stalking victims (Spitzberg, Nicastro, & Cousins, 1998). The Cronbach’s alpha of this measure in the current study was .94. The ORI measure can be found in Appendix B.

**Alexithymia.** Alexithymia was measured for the current by the Toronto Alexithymia Scale (TAS), a 20-item self-report measure (Bagby, Parker, & Taylor, 1994). The TAS has a three factor structure: a person’s difficulty identifying feelings (e.g., “When I am upset, I don’t know if I am sad, frightened, or angry.”), difficulty
describing feelings (e.g., “It is difficult for me to find the right words for my feelings.”),
and externally oriented thinking (e.g., “I prefer to just let things happen rather than to understand why they turned out that way.”). The participants will rate each item as it applied to her on a five-point Likert scale that range from 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 5 (“strong agree”). Total scores range from 20 to 100, and were used for the analysis of the current study. The TAS has good internal consistency (alpha = .81), and good test-retest reliability ($r = .77$). The TAS also has good evidence of concurrent validity in both clinical and nonclinical samples (Bagby, Taylor, & Parker, 1994; Bagby, Parker, & Taylor, 1994). The Cronbach’s alpha of this measure in the current study was .88. The TAS can be found in Appendix C.

**Drinking Problems.** Problematic drinking was assessed using a subscale of the Core Alcohol and Drug Survey that assesses consequences of drinking alcohol (Core Institute, 2005). The Drinking Consequences Subscale is an 18-item self-report measure that is rated on a Likert scale that ranges from 1 (“never”) to 6 (“10 or more times”). Each item describes a negative situation that results from problematic drinking (e.g., “had a hangover, missed a class, been hurt or injured”). The participants were told to rate how many times each item’s situation had happened to them. The total score has a range of 18 to 108, and the total score will be used for the current study. This measure was developed by reviewing literature and instruments assessing substance abuse, and then having a group of professionals vote on inclusion of items with an inter-rater agreement of .90 over a two week period (CORE Institute, 2005). The Core Alcohol and Drug Survey have been found to have a test-retest reliability of 90% agreement over a two week period (Page & O’Hegarty, 2006). The Drinking Consequence Subscale has been found to be
consistent with patterns of alcohol-related arrest reports (Thompson, Leinfelt, & Smyth, 2006). The Cronbach’s alpha of this measure in the current study was .87. The Drinking Consequence Subscale can be found in Appendix D.

**Dependent Personality Disorder (DPD).** Dependent personality tendencies will be measured using a DPD subscale from the Personality Disorders Questionnaire (PDQ) (Hyler, Rieder, Williams, Spitzer, Hendler, & Lyons, 1988). The DPD subscale is 15-item self-report measure that is rated by a 1 (true) or a 2 (false). Each item portrays an aspect of DPD diagnosis (e.g., “When a close relationship ends, I need to get involved with someone else immediately.”). Each true response is scored as one. The total score ranges from 15-30, and the total score was used for the current study. The PDQ has been found to discriminate well between individuals with significant personality disorder traits and those who do not have significant personality disorder traits (Hyler et al., 1988). It is found the PDQ to be relatively stable over time (Ouimette & Klein, 1995). Specifically, the PDQ results have been found to have good stability over a 3 month period (Trull, 1993). The Cronbach’s alpha of this measure in the current study was .73. The DPD subscale of the PDQ can be found in Appendix E.

**Hyperfemininity.** Hyperfemininity was measured using the Hyperfemininity Inventory, a self-report measure that assesses traditional gender role beliefs, gender rights, and sexual attitudes (Murnen & Byrne, 1991). The Hyperfemininity Inventory is a 26-item scale rated by selecting one of two beliefs per item. For example, the participant would choose either “Men need sex more than women do” or “In general, there is no difference between the sexual needs of women and men” (Murnen & Byrne, 1991). Each item is scored as 1 or 2, for a total score ranging from 26 to 52. The total score was used
for the purposes of the current study. One study found the test-retest reliability to be .89 over a two week period, and the Hyperfemininity Inventory has been associated with other measures reflecting supportive attitudes towards traditional gender roles (Murnen & Byrne, 1991). The Cronbach’s alpha of this measure in the current study was .72. The Hyperfemininity Inventory can be found in Appendix F.

**Assertiveness.** Assertiveness was measured using the 20-item Rathus Assertiveness Schedule Short Form (SRAS-SF) (Jenerette & Dexon, 2010). A sample item is “I am careful to avoid hurting other people’s feeling, even when I feel that I have been injured.” The 20-item RAS is a self-report measure with each item rated on a 6-point Likert scale from 1 (“very characteristic”) to 6 (“very uncharacteristic”). The total score ranges from 20 to 120, and for the current study a total score was used. The SRAF-SF has a correlation of .98 with the original RAS, and have similar Cronbach αs (RAS .85, SRAS-SF .80) (Jenerette & Dexon, 2010). The RAS was found to have a test-retest reliability of .78 and a split-half reliability of .77 (Rathus, 1973). In addition, the RAS is correlated with constructs such as confidence, boldness, assertiveness, and aggressiveness (Rathus, 1973). The Cronbach’s alpha of this measure in the current study was .82. The RAS-SF is in Appendix G.

**Agreeableness.** A 20-item Agreeableness Questionnaire from the International Personality Item Pool (Goldberg, 1999) was used to measure agreeableness. The Agreeableness Questionnaire is a self-report measure that is rated on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (“inaccurate”) to 5 (“very inaccurate”). Each item assesses participants’ interpersonal style of either creating a warm, friendly interaction (e.g., “I make people feel at ease,” “I trust what people say”), or fostering a more hostile, contentious
interaction (e.g., “I cut others to pieces,” “I suspect hidden motives in others”). The total score ranges from 20 to 100, and the total score was used for the current study. The Agreeableness Questionnaire has good internal reliability (Alpha = .85) (Goldberg, 1999). The Agreeableness Questionnaire also is correlated with agreeableness domain of the NEO-PI-R (Goldberg, 1999). The Cronbach’s alpha of this measure in the current study was .87. The Agreeableness Questionnaire can be found in Appendix H.

Procedure

Participants from an introductory psychology class (predominantly, freshmen and sophomores) were recruited through the Department of Psychology Sona systems website, while upper-level psychology course participants were recruited in person during class. Students from upper-level psychology courses who were interested in participation sent an email message to the researcher expressing their interest in the study and then were sent an email message containing their Sona username and password for online survey access. Participants then logged into the Sona system and completed all questionnaires online. Upon starting the online questionnaires they viewed a consent form that listed in plain language the objective of the study, possible risks, and that participation was voluntary and will not negatively affect their course grade should they refuse participation at any time. To ensure participants’ confidentiality, participants’ names were deleted at the end of data collection. Reading the confidentiality information through Sona online and subsequently completing the questionnaires were determine as consent. Each participant viewed the demographic data sheet first, and the order of the seven questionnaires was determined by using a random starting order with rotation (e.g.,
CBA, BAC, ACB). Upon completion participants viewed a thank you message and a
debriefing statement.
RESULTS

Preliminary Analysis

Descriptive statistics for the variables in the current study are summarized in Tables 1 and 2. Table 1 summarizes the percentages and frequencies of the nominal and ordinal variables, while Table 2 summarizes the means and standard deviations of the continuous variables. Preliminary analyses were conducted examining the relationships between the criterion variable (i.e., stalking) and demographic variables in order to assess for the possibility of any confounding variables. A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted on the categorical demographic variable of ethnic background. The results indicated that there were significant group differences for the ethnic background \(F(3, 212) = 4.43, p < .01\) on stalking. Tukey post-hoc comparisons of the four groups indicate that Caucasian participants scored lower on stalking \(M=41.29, SD=13.81\) than Latina participants \(M=55.44, SD=20.11\). Therefore, this variable was statistically controlled in the primary study analyses.

Zero-order correlations were calculated between the criterion variable (i.e., stalking) and continuous demographic variable of age. There was a statistically significant negative correlation between stalking and age \(r = -.20, p < .01\), such that older participants were less likely to have a stalking history in comparison to younger participants. Younger participants may rely more heavily on social networks (i.e., Facebook) for socialization on campus than their older cohorts. While older participants
may differ on how they define stalking, and rate fewer behaviors as stalker than their younger cohorts. Therefore, age was controlled in the main analyses.

**Primary Analysis**

To test Hypothesis 1 through 3, the simple relationships between the predictor (i.e., PTSD and associated characteristics, self-reliance variables, and agreeableness) and criterion variable (i.e., stalking) were examined. A correlation matrix was computed between the predictor and criterion variables, which can be viewed in Table 3.

**Hypothesis 1.** This hypothesis stated that there would be a positive correlation between stalking victimization and both alexithymia and drinking problems. The results revealed a statistically significant, negative correlation between alexithymia and stalking victimization \((r = -.19, p < .01)\), and a statistically significant, positive correlation between drinking problems and stalking victimization \((r = .35, p < .01)\). Specifically, these results indicate that participants who scored low in alexithymia and high in drinking problems were more likely to score high on stalking victimization. Thus, my hypothesis was supported for drinking problems, but not alexithymia.

**Hypothesis 2.** This hypothesis stated that there would be significant, positive correlations between stalking victimization and dependent personality characteristics and hyperfemininity, and negative correlation with assertiveness. The results indicated that there was a statistically significant positive correlation between hyperfemininity and stalking victimization \((r = .15, p < .05)\), and no statistically significant correlation
between dependent personality characteristics or assertiveness with stalking victimization. Specifically, these results indicate that participants who scored high in hyperfemininity were more likely to score high on stalking victimization, but that dependent personality characteristics and assertiveness were not associated with participants’ experience of stalking victimization.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant Stalking History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalked</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stalked</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Relationship to Stalker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague or Service Relationship</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Member or Relative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Dating Relationship</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Dating Relationship</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Spouse, Estranged or Separated Spouse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2

*Descriptive Statistics for Continuous Study Measures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min-Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stalk</td>
<td>42.32</td>
<td>15.68</td>
<td>30-142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>89.41</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>58-119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexithymia</td>
<td>72.39</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>44-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12.64</td>
<td>34-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depend</td>
<td>24.11</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>15-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Problems</td>
<td>34.76</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>18-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperfemininity</td>
<td>33.46</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>26-48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Stalk = Stalking Victimization; Depend = Dependent Personality Characteristics
TABLE 3

Zero-Order Correlations Between Primary Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Stalk</th>
<th>Etoh</th>
<th>Alex</th>
<th>Depend</th>
<th>Hypfem</th>
<th>Assert</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stalk</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etoh</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depend</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.57**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypfem</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assert</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Stalk = Stalking Victimization; Etoh = Drinking Problems; Alex = Alexithymia; Depend = Dependent Personality Characteristics; Hypfem = Hyperfemininity; Assert = Assertiveness; Agree = Agreeableness.
*p < .05. **p < .01.
Thus, support for my hypothesis was found with respect to hyperfemininity, but not but not dependent personality characteristics or assertiveness.

**Hypothesis 3.** This hypothesis stated that there would be a positive correlation between participants’ standing on agreeableness and stalking victimization. The results indicated that there was a statistically significant negative correlation between agreeableness and stalking victimization ($r = -.24, p < .01$). Specifically, these results indicate that participants that scored low on agreeableness were more likely to score high on stalking victimization. Thus, Hypothesis 3 was not supported.

**Hypothesis 4.** This hypothesis stated that agreeableness, assertiveness, dependency, and hyperfemininity would be significant predictors of stalking victimization above and beyond alexithymia and alcohol abuse. The results indicated that agreeableness, assertiveness, dependency, and hyperfemininity as a set of predictors did not predict stalking victimization above and beyond alexithymia and alcohol abuse ($R^2\Delta = .03, p = .15$). However, agreeableness was significantly negatively associated with stalking victimization above and beyond alexithymia and alcohol abuse ($\beta = -.18, p < .05$). Specifically, this indicates that participants who scored low on agreeableness were more likely to score high on stalking victimization, and that this variable contributed unique variance in the prediction of stalking beyond alexithymia and alcohol abuse. Thus, Hypothesis 4 was not supported. The results of this hierarchical regression can be viewed in Table 4.

**Hypothesis 5.** The hypothesis stated that the type of prior relationship with the stalker would act as a moderator between the hypothesized predictors and stalking
victimization. In other words, Predictor x Relationship to Stalker interactions would predict stalking victimization above main effects for either of those two sets of variables alone. While 54 participants reported knowing their stalker, only 3 participants reported not knowing their stalker. This small number of participants who reported being stalked by a stranger did not allow for a meaningful analysis to test Hypothesis 5.
**TABLE 4**

*Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting Stalking Victimization*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>(\Delta R^2)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Abuse</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexithymia</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-2.21</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperfemininity</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-1.79</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Betas reported are those from the step at which the variable was entered into the equation.
DISCUSSION

The current study sought to identify predictors of stalking victimization in order to help inform future prevention programs. Since research on stalking perpetrators is more plentiful than research on stalking victims, possible predictors were selected based on other forms of victimization (i.e., domestic violence, rape, childhood abuse, etc.). We found problematic drinking (HY1) and hyperfemininity (HY2) to be positively, significantly associated with stalking. Contrary to hypotheses, we also found that alexithymia (HY1) and agreeableness (HY3) were negatively associated with stalking. However, dependent personality characteristics and assertiveness were found to have no significant association with stalking victimization (HY2). In addition, we found that agreeableness contributed unique variance to the prediction of stalking victimization above alexithymia and problematic drinking (HY4). Very few self-identified stalking victims claimed that they did not know their stalkers, and therefore, we were unable to determine if there were significant differences in predictors as a function of the relationship between the stalker and victim (HY5).

In the remainder of the discussion, I will begin by discussing each hypothesis in more depth, including consistencies and inconsistencies with past research, and implications of the study findings. Finally, I will discuss study limitations and future research directions.
Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis was that problematic drinking and alexithymia would be positively associated with stalking victimization. This hypothesis was partially supported in that problematic drinking was significantly associated with stalking victimization. However, surprisingly, alexithymia was negatively associated with stalking victimization. Prior research has not found a significant association between alexithymia and domestic violence (Taylor, 2000), but sexual victimization has been significantly linked to alexithymia. Specifically, alexithymia has been found to be positively associated with child sexual abuse, rape, and sexual revictimization (Cloitre et al., 1997; Scher & Twain, 1994; Zeitline et al., 1993). Prior research has not investigated the relationship between alexithymia and stalking victimization. The negative relationship between alexithymia and stalking found in the current study was not expected. However, it appears to suggest that, unlike what has been found to be the case with respect to sexual abuse, alexithymia may actually serve as a protective factor rather than a risk factor for stalking victimization. An alternate explanation those who are low in alexithymia may have a tendency to more able to label stalking behaviors than those who are high in alexithymia. Clearly, these findings need to be replicated in future research.

The finding that problematic drinking was positively associated with stalking victimization has been supported by prior research linking problematic drinking and domestic violence (Jewkes, Levin, & Penn-Kekana, 2002; Seedat et al., 2005). Several studies also demonstrate a positive relationship between sexual assault victimization and problematic drinking (Molitor, Ruiz, Klausher, & McFarland, 2000; Ullman, Karabatsos, & Koss, 1999). As has been theorized with respect to sexual assault victimization, it is
possible that the observed association between stalking victimization and problematic drinking reflects a tendency on the part of the victim to put herself in risky situations (Moliter et al., 2000). Alternatively, stalking victims may use alcohol as a way of coping with the stress associated with being stalked. Future research could discern the temporal ordering of these variables through the use of cross-lagged longitudinal designs.

**Hypothesis 2**

The second hypothesis was that stalking victimization is positively correlated with dependent personality characteristics and hyperfemininity and negatively correlated with assertiveness. The hypothesis was partially supported in that hyperfemininity was found to be significantly, positively associated with stalking victimization. However, there were no significant associations between the other power variables of dependent personality characteristics or assertiveness and stalking victimization. The lack of a significant finding for assertiveness is somewhat puzzling because prior research has found a negative association between assertiveness and hyperfeminine characteristic (Toler et al., 1984), thus, it is unclear why a significant relationship was found between hyperfemininity and stalking, but not between assertiveness and stalking. That absence of such a finding seems to imply those victims’ attempts to assertively confront their stalker does not seem to be a deterrent of stalkers’ behavior.

While the Hyperfemininity Inventory (Murnen & Byrne, 1991) is mainly used in research on hyperfemininity due to the lack of other scales available, and raises questions of results influences by which population is used (i.e., college students, teenagers, adults, elderly, and etc.) with a possible social bias influence on respondents. However, a new scale may be in the future with it being further defined by McKelvie and Gold (1994)
they found hyperfemininity to be linked to feeling alienated from self and others, and experiencing psychological problems (i.e., high levels of anxiety and high levels of interpersonal sensitivity). Perhaps these new dimensions will result in a new scale that measures hyperfemininity more accurately with this definition expansion.

It is the same theme of lack of expression of personal power that was behind my hypothesis that dependent personality disorder tendencies would be associated with stalking victimization. Prior research has identified a link between dependent personality and the experience of domestic violence (Bornstein, 2006). One possible explanation for the contradiction between what I found with respect to stalking and what the other research has found with domestic violence is that dependent personality tendencies have been attributed to being unable to leave a domestic abuse situation, (Bornstein, 2006). In contrast, in the case of stalking victimization the person has either left the relationship or was never in a relationship with the stalker in the first place. Thus, dependent personality characteristic may not play as much of a role in stalking victimization as in domestic violence, because there is less of a choice involved in leaving the relationship.

**Hypothesis 3**

The third hypothesis was that agreeableness would be positively associated with stalking victimization. The hypothesis was not supported. However, there was a significant, negative association between agreeableness and stalking victimization. Prior research is not consistent with the current finding. Prior research has found that people high in agreeableness have more positive emotions and thoughts towards aggressive and anger-evoking situations (Meier & Robinson, 2004; Robinson & Wilkowski, 2006). However, the use of this predictor variable in the current study was exploratory in nature,
as there was not as much prior research available on it as the other predictor variables in
the current study. Attempts should be made in future research to understand the negative
association between agreeableness and stalking victimization found in the current study.
These findings may suggest that if a victim is unkind towards the stalker it may lead to
more rather than less stalking behaviors. Another explanation is that persons low in
agreeableness may be more likely to perceive certain behaviors as stalking in comparison
to persons high in agreeableness.

Hypothesis 4

The fourth hypothesis was that agreeableness, assertiveness, dependency, and
hyperfemininity would be significant predictors of stalking victimization above and
beyond alexithymia and problematic drinking. The hypothesis was not supported.
However, agreeableness was significantly associated with stalking victimization above
alexithymia and problematic drinking. Thus, even though as stated above, the negative
association between agreeableness and stalking victimization was unexpected, the results
of this analysis suggests that low levels of agreeableness add a unique amount of variance
in the prediction of stalking victimization above more well-establish predictors. This
finding, again, points to the importance of attempting to replicate and better understand
this result in future studies.

Hypothesis 5

The fifth hypothesis was that the type of relationship with the stalker would act as
moderator between the hypothesized predictors and stalking victimization. Unfortunately,
the numbers of women that did not know their stalkers were too small for a meaningful
analysis of this hypothesis. The low number of this type of victim may be due to the
college environment facilitating a climate where more people are known (via classes, clubs, campus activities, etc.) in the surrounding college community and especially with the addition of social networks like Facebook. Further, not knowing one’s perpetrator may be more common when the victim is a celebrity or other type of well-known public figure. Thus, this hypothesis remains to be tested in future research.

In conclusion, few studies have explored factors related to stalking victimization. We investigated demographic variables and six, theoretically derived variables (drinking problems, hyperfemininity, alexithymia, assertiveness, dependent personality tendencies, and agreeableness). Support was found for two of the six variables in the predicted direction and two more in a non-predicted direction (agreeableness and alexithymia). Because of the exploratory nature of this study, more research is needed in order to replicate these findings, develop and test theories as to why these variables predict stalking, and explore new predictors that were not included in the current study. What I found in terms of demographic variables is that younger female college students were stalked more than their older cohorts. This may also be related to the result found that female students with problematic drinking was linked to stalking victimization. Since younger students may rely more heavily on social networking it is possible that they may attend more parties where a lot of alcohol is being consumed. Alternatively, older student may have changed their personal definitions of stalking victimization over the course of their college careers. Thus, while they may have perceived certain behaviors as stalking at an earlier age, in retrospect, they may no longer see those same instances in the same light. This explanation speaks to the importance in future studies on this topic of supplementing self-report questionnaires with other methods such as crime statistics.
Limitations and Future Directions

The first limitation encountered was the lack of research directly related to the predictions of stalking victimization made in the current study. While I was able to justify the use of other victimization research, there is much more that needs to be defined and explored with victims of stalking in order to understand and hopefully develop programs to protect women that are at high risk for being stalked. Further, I was only able to find one measure that assessed stalking victimization, and hopefully with further research more measures can be developed for various stalking victimization future research needs.

Another limitation is that in the current study I was unable to conduct any analysis on how previous relationship of known versus unknown stalker due to lack of self-identified victims of stalking reporting they did not know their stalker. Future research could examine the predictors in the current study with stalking victims that had previously unknown stalkers. Perhaps this can be accomplished through different recruitment methods that would allow for larger number of participants with unknown stalkers to participate. This could be accomplished by recruiting participants from a population that has more likelihood of people being completely unknown to each other such as a community or commuter college. In community or commuter colleges, it may be more likely that a greater amount of students come only for class attendance, and not to socialize with other students on campus. Alternatively, assuming it is the case that public figures are less likely to know their stalkers, it may be beneficial to make active attempts to recruit such individuals in future research.
The next limitation is the use of a cross-sectional design. Cross-section data does not allow for testing assumptions about the temporal order of variables. Another limitation is that there were no male participants in the current study. Prior research has found that male stalking victims are more likely to be cyber-stalked than women (Alexy et al., 2005). Future research could examine whether there are different predictors of stalking victimization in men or when the stalking occurs via technology rather than in person. Future research could also identify the negative ramifications of male stalking victims, and how male stalking victims identify themselves as being a stalking victim. Do they require more severe stalking behaviors to identify as a victim of stalking? Do they interpret certain stalking behaviors as flattery?

In conclusion, the current study set out to identify predictors of stalking victimization for women. While we were able to identify some significant predictors of stalking victimization, they were not all in the direction predicted. Even though some of these findings were unexpected, in view of the fact that so little research has been done on this topic, they can serve as a useful point of departure for future research.
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APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHICS DATA SHEET

1. Race
   ___ White/Caucasian
   ___ African American
   ___ Asian American
   ___ Hispanic/Latino
   ___ Other (Please Specify):_________________

2. Age ____

3. Year in School
   ___ Freshman
   ___ Sophomore
   ___ Junior
   ___ Senior
APPENDIX B

OBSESSIVE RELATIONAL INTRUSION (Victim Short Form)  
(© Spitzberg & Cupach, 1997)

People often pursue intimate relationships without realizing that the person being pursued does not want such a relationship. These pursuers may want friendship, or romantic intimacy, or perhaps just recognition. In addition, they often do things that do not appear in normal circumstances to be intimate, such as invading your privacy, intruding into your life, and/or making threats (e.g., “if you don’t go out with me, I’ll kill myself”), or refusing to let go. We are interested in finding out if you have ever experienced such a “relationship,” and what kinds of actions this pursuer displayed.

In your lifetime, how often, if at all, has anyone ever obsessively pursued you over a period of time for the purpose of establishing an intimate relationship that you did NOT want? That is, ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circle the best Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Has anyone ever undesirably & obsessively pursued you by...

1. LEAVING UNWANTED GIFTS  
(e.g., flowers, stuffed animals, photographs, jewelry, etc.)

2. LEAVING UNWANTED MESSAGES OF AFFECTION  
(e.g., romantically-oriented notes, cards, letters, voice-mail, e-mail, messages with friends, etc.)

3. MAKING EXAGGERATED EXPRESSIONS OF AFFECTION  
(e.g., saying “I love you” after limited interaction, doing large and unsolicited favors for you, etc.)

4. FOLLOWING YOU AROUND  
(e.g., following you to or from work, school, home, gym, daily activities, etc.)

5. WATCHING YOU  
(e.g., driving by home or work, watching you from a distance, gazing at you in public places, etc.)

6. INTRUDING UNINVITED INTO YOUR INTERACTIONS  
(e.g., “hovers” around your conversations, offers unsolicited advice, initiates conversations when you are clearly busy, etc.)
Has anyone ever undesirably & obsessively pursued you by...

7. INVADING YOUR PERSONAL SPACE
   (e.g., getting too close to you in conversation, touching you, etc.)

8. INVOLVING YOU IN ACTIVITIES IN UNWANTED WAYS
   (e.g., enrolling you in programs, putting you on mailing lists, using your name as a reference, etc.)

9. INVADING YOUR PERSONAL PROPERTY
   (e.g., handling your possessions, breaking and entering into your home, showing up at your door or car, etc.)

In your lifetime, how often, if at all, has anyone ever obsessively pursued you over a period of time for the purpose of establishing an intimate relationship that you did NOT want? That is . . .

Circle the best Answer

NEVER 1 2 3 4 5 TIMES

10. INTRUDING UPON YOUR FRIENDS, FAMILY OR COWORKERS
    (e.g., trying to befriend your friends, family or coworkers; seeking to be invited to social events, seeking employment at your work, etc.)

11. MONITORING YOU AND/OR YOUR BEHAVIOR
    (e.g., calling at all hours to check on your whereabouts, checking up on you through mutual friends, etc.)

12. APPROACHING OR SURPRISING YOU IN PUBLIC PLACES
    (e.g., showing up at places such as stores, work, gym; lying in wait around corners, etc.)

13. COVERTLY OBTAINING PRIVATE INFORMATION
    (e.g., listening to your message machine, taking photos of you without your knowledge, stealing your mail or e-mail, etc.)

14. INVADING YOUR PROPERTY
    (e.g., breaking and entering your home, car, desk, backpack or briefcase, etc.)

15. LEAVING UNWANTED THREATENING MESSAGES
    (e.g., hang-up calls; notes, cards, letters, voice-mail, e-mail, messages with friends, implying harm or potential harm, etc.)

16. PHYSICALLY RESTRAINING YOU
    (e.g., grabbing your arm, blocking your progress, holding your car door while you’re in the car, etc.)

17. ENGAGING IN REGULATORY HARASSMENT
    (e.g., filing official complaints, spreading false rumors to officials—boss, instructor, etc., obtaining a restraining order on you, etc.)
Has anyone ever undesirably & obsessively pursued you by...

18. STEALING OR DAMAGING VALUED POSSESSIONS
   (e.g., you found property vandalized; things missing, damaged or hurt
   that only this person had access to, such as prior gifts, pets, etc.)

19. THREATENING TO HURT HIM- OR HERSELF
   (e.g., vague threats that something bad will happen to
   him- or herself, threatening to commit suicide, etc.)

In your lifetime, how often, if at all, has anyone ever obsessively pursued you over a period of time for
the purpose of establishing an intimate relationship that you did NOT want? That is . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circle the best Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. THREATENING OTHERS YOU CARE ABOUT
   (e.g., threatening harm to or making vague warnings
   about romantic partners, friends, family, pets, etc.)

21. VERA LY THREATENING YOU PERSONALLY
   (e.g., threats or vague warnings that something bad will
   happen to you, threatening personally to hurt you, etc.)

22. LEAVING OR SENDING YOU THREATENING OBJECTS
   (e.g., marked up photographs, photographs taken of you
   without your knowledge, pornography, weapons, etc.)

23. SHOWING UP AT PLACES IN THREATENING WAYS
   (e.g., showing up at class, office or work, from behind a corner,
   staring from across a street, being inside your home, etc.)

24. SEXUALLY COERCING YOU
   (e.g., forcefully attempted/succeeded in kissing, feeling, or
   disrobing you, exposed him/herself, forced sexual behavior, etc.)

25. PHYSICALLY THREATENING YOU
   (e.g., throwing something at you, acting as if s/he will hit you,
   running finger across neck implying throat slitting, etc.)

26. PHYSICALLY HURTING YOU
   (e.g., pushing or shoving you, slapping you, hitting you
   with fist, hitting you with an object, etc.)

27. KIDNAPPING OR PHYSICALLY CONSTRAINING YOU
   (e.g., by force or threat of force, trapped you in a car or room;
   bound you; took you places against your will; etc.)

28. PHYSICALLY ENDANGERING YOUR LIFE
   (e.g., trying to run you off the road, displaying a weapon
   in front of you, using a weapon to subdue you, etc.)
Has anyone ever undesirably & obsessively pursued you by...
29. CONTACTING YOU THROUGH FACEBOOK
   (e.g. posting on your wall, emailing, instant messaging, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5

Has anyone ever undesirably & obsessively pursued you by...
30. LOCATING YOU THRU INFORMATION ON FACEBOOK
   (e.g., where you work, where you go to school, where you live, etc.)

The next items ask you to indicate whether you have experienced a certain type of relationship pursuit at some point in your life. If at any point your answer is “NO,” or the item does not apply to you, skip to the next item of the survey.

31. If you answered any of the previous 30 items with anything other than “0”, what is the sex of the person who was your most persistent unwanted pursuer? ___ MALE ___ FEMALE

32. “During some period of my life I have experienced being followed and/or harassed and/or obsessively pursued by someone.” ___ YES ___ NO

33. If “yes” to #32, did it occur in a manner that you personally felt was threatening, or placed you in fear of your own safety, or the safety and security of your family, friends, or possessions . . . ___ YES ___ NO

34. If “yes” to #32, approximately how long did it occur, in . . . ___ Years ___ Months

35. If “yes” to #34, would you consider what you experienced as a form of “stalking.” That is, have you ever been “stalked”? ___ YES ___ NO

36. If “yes” to #35, on average how many times a month did this person do something to stalk you? ___ Number?

37. If “yes” to #35, how many different people have you been stalked by? ___ Number?

38. If “yes” to #35, what was the sex of the person pursuing you? ___ MALE ___ FEMALE

39. If “yes” to #35, do you have reason to believe that this person has stalked others before or after you? ___ YES ___ NO

40. If “yes” to #35, what type of relationship did you have, if any, prior to the time that the pursuit became unwanted?
   ___ STRANGER
   ___ ACQUAINTANCE
   ___ COLLEAGUE, OR SERVICE RELATIONSHIP
   ___ FRIENDSHIP
   ___ FAMILY MEMBER OR RELATIVE
   ___ “CASUALLY DATING” RELATIONSHIP
   ___ “SERIOUSLY DATING” RELATIONSHIP
   ___ SPOUSE
   ___ EX-SPOUSE, ESTRANGED OR SEPARATED SPOUSE
   ___ OTHER (Please specify: ______________________)

41. If “yes” to #35, and if it has since stopped, why do you think the Person ultimately stopped stalking or pursuing you? Explain briefly:
42. How long did the relationship in #38 last before the person’s pursuit became unwanted? ___ Years ___ Months

43. How long ago did the relationship in #38 begin? ___ Years ___ Months

44. Do you believe that YOU have ever engaged in romantic pursuit in ways that a reasonable person might consider to be stalking? ___ YES ___ NO

45. What is your sex? ___ MALE ___ FEMALE
APPENDIX C

TORONTO ALEXITHYMIA SCALE (TAS)

Ratings of Feelings

Directions: Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by circling a number from 1 to 5 provided each statement.

1. I am often confused about what emotion I am feeling.
   *Strongly disagree* 1 2 3 4 5  *Strongly agree*

2. It is difficult for me to find the right words for my feelings.
   *Strongly disagree* 1 2 3 4 5  *Strongly agree*

3. I have physical sensations that even doctors don’t understand.
   *Strongly disagree* 1 2 3 4 5  *Strongly agree*

4. I am able to describe my feelings easily.*
   *Strongly disagree* 1 2 3 4 5  *Strongly agree*

5. I prefer to analyze problems rather than just describe them.
   *Strongly disagree* 1 2 3 4 5  *Strongly agree*

6. When I am upset, I don’t know if I am sad, frightened, or angry.
   *Strongly disagree* 1 2 3 4 5  *Strongly agree*

7. I am often puzzled by sensations in my body.
   *Strongly disagree* 1 2 3 4 5  *Strongly agree*

8. I prefer to just let things happen rather than to understand why they turned out that way.
   *Strongly disagree* 1 2 3 4 5  *Strongly agree*

9. I have feelings that I can’t quite identify.
   *Strongly disagree* 1 2 3 4 5  *Strongly agree*
10. Being in touch with emotions is essential*
   *Strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  Strongly agree*

11. I find it hard to describe how I feel about people.
   *Strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  Strongly agree*

12. People tell me to describe my feelings more.
   *Strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  Strongly agree*

13. I don’t know what’s going on inside me.
   *Strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  Strongly agree*

14. I often don’t know why I am angry.
   *Strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  Strongly agree*

15. I prefer talking to people about their daily activities rather than their feelings.
   *Strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  Strongly agree*

16. I prefer to watch “light” entertainment shows rather than psychological dramas.
   *Strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  Strongly agree*

17. It is difficult for me to reveal my innermost feelings, even to close friends.
   *Strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  Strongly agree*

18. I can feel close to someone, even in moments of silence. *
   *Strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  Strongly agree*

19. I find examination of my feelings useful in solving personal problems.*
   *Strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  Strongly agree*

20. Looking for hidden meanings in movies or plays distracts from their enjoyment.
   *Strongly disagree  1  2  3  4  5  Strongly agree*

Items that are reversed scored are marked with a *.
APPENDIX D

CONSEQUENCES OF DRINKING SUBSCALE

Please indicate how often you have experienced the following due to drinking alcohol during the last year.

a. never.
b. once.
c. twice.
d. 3-5 times.
e. 6-9 times.
f. 10 or more times.

1. _____ Had a hangover.
2. _____ Performed poorly on a test or important project.
3. _____ Been in trouble with police, resident hall, or other college authorities.
4. _____ Damaged property, pulled fire alarms, etc.
5. _____ Got into an argument of a fight.
6. _____ Got nauseated or vomited.
7. _____ Driven a car while under the influence.
8. _____ Missed a class.
9. _____ Been criticized by someone I know.
10. _____ Thought I might have a drinking problem.
11. _____ Had a memory loss.
12. _____ Done something I later regretted.
13. _____ Been arrested for DWI/DUI.
14. _____ Have been taken advantage of sexually.
15. ____ Tried to unsuccessfully stop using.
16. ____ Seriously thought about suicide.
17. ____ Seriously tried to commit suicide.
18. ____ Been hurt or injured
APPENDIX E

DEPENDENT PERSONALITY DISORDER SUBSCALE

PDQ

Directions: Please indicate whether you believe that the following statements are Generally True or Generally False for you.

T  F  1. I avoid working with others who may criticize me.

T  F  2. I make friends with people only when I am sure they like me.

T  F  3. I am inhibited in my intimate relationships because I am afraid of being ridiculed.

T  F  4. I am more sensitive to criticism or rejection than most people.

T  F  5. I am afraid to meet new people because I feel inadequate.

T  F  6. I suffer from low self-esteem.

T  F  7. In new situations, I fear being embarrassed.

T  F  8. I can’t make decisions without the advice, or reassurance, of others.

T  F  9. I prefer that other people assume responsibility for me.

T  F  10. I fear losing the support of others if I disagree with them.

T  F  11. I find it difficult to start something if I have to do it by myself.

T  F  12. I want people to like me so much that I volunteer to do things that I’d rather not do.

T  F  13. When alone, I feel helpless and unable to care for myself.

T  F  14. When a close relationship ends, I need to get involved with someone else Immediately
T    F   15. I am terrified of being left to care for myself
Please choose one of two statements which you feel is most similar to your beliefs and/or behaviors.

1. a. These days men and women should each pay for their own expenses on a date.  
   b. Men should always be ready to accept financial responsibility of a date.

2. a. I would rather be a famous scientist than a famous fashion model.  
   b. I would rather be a famous fashion model than a famous scientist.

3. a. I like a man who has some sexual experience.  
   b. Sexual experience is not relevant factor in my choice for a male partner.

4. a. Women should never break up a friendship due to interest in the same man.  
   b. Sometimes women have to compete with one another for men.

5. a. I like to play hard to get.  
   b. I don’t like to play games in a relationship.

6. a. I would agree to have sex with a man if I thought I could get him to do what I want.  
   b. I never use sex as a way to manipulate men.

7. a. I try to state my sexual needs clearly and concisely.  
   b. I sometimes say “no” but really mean “yes”.

8. a. I like to flirt with men.  
   b. I enjoy an interesting conversation with a man.

9. a. I seldom consider a relationship with a man as more important than my friendship with a woman.  
   b. I have broken dates with female friends when a guy has asked me out.

10. a. I usually pay for my expenses on a date.  
    b. I expect the men I date to take care of my expenses.
11. a. Sometimes I cry to influence a man.
b. I prefer to use logical rather than emotional means of persuasion when necessary.

12. a. Men need sex more than women do.
b. In general, there is no difference between the sexual needs of women and men.

13. a. I never use my sexuality to manipulate men.
b. I sometimes act sexy to get what I want from a man.

14. a. I feel anger when men whistle at me.
b. I feel a little flattered when men whistle at me.

15. a. It’s okay for a man to be a little forceful to get sex.
b. Any force used during sex is sexual coercion and should not be tolerated.

16. a. Effeminate men deserve to be ridiculed.
b. So-called effeminate men are very attractive.

17. a. Women who are good at sports probably turn men off.
b. Men like women who are good at sports because of competence.

18. a. A “real” man is one who can get any woman to have sex with him.
b. Masculinity is not determined by sexual success.

19. a. I would rather be president of the US than the wife of the president.
b. I would rather be the wife of the president of the US than the president.

20. a. Sometimes I care more about my boyfriend’s feelings than my own.
b. It is as important to me that I am as satisfied with a relationship as my partner is.

21. a. Most women need a man in their lives.
b. I believe some women lead happy lives without male partners.

22. a. When a man I’m with gets really sexually excited, it is no use trying to stop him from getting what he wants.
b. Men should be able to control their sexual excitement.

23. a. I like to have a man “wrapped around my finger”.
b. I like the relationships in which both partners are equal.

24. a. I try to avoid jealousy in a relationship.
b. Sometimes women need to make men feel jealous so they will be more appreciative.
25.  a. I sometimes promise to have sex with a man to make sure he stays interested in me.
    b. I usually state my intentions honestly and openly.

26.  a. I like to feel tipsy so I have an excuse to do anything with a man.
    b. I don’t like getting too drunk around a man I don’t know very well.
APPENDIX G

RATHUS ASSERTIVENESS SCHEDULE SHORT FORM

RAS-SF
1. Most people seem to be more aggressive and assertive than I am *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Uncharacteristic</th>
<th>Very Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. I have hesitated to make or accept dates because of “shyness” *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Uncharacteristic</th>
<th>Very Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. When the food is served at a restaurant is not done to my satisfaction, I Complain about it to the waiter or waitress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Uncharacteristic</th>
<th>Very Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. I am careful to avoid hurting other people’s feelings, even when I feel that I have been injured.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Uncharacteristic</th>
<th>Very Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. If a salesman has gone to considerable trouble to show me merchandise that is not quite suitable, I have a difficult time saying “No.” *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Uncharacteristic</th>
<th>Very Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. There are times when I look for a good vigorous argument.

   **Very Uncharacteristic**  **Very Characteristic**
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6

7. I strive to get ahead as well as most people in my position

   **Very Uncharacteristic**  **Very Characteristic**
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6

8. To be honest, people often take advantage of me*

   **Very Uncharacteristic**  **Very Characteristic**
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6

9. I will hesitate to make phone calls to business establishments and institutions*

   **Very Uncharacteristic**  **Very Characteristic**
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6

10. I find it embarrassing to return merchandise*

    **Very Uncharacteristic**  **Very Characteristic**
    
    1 2 3 4 5 6

11. If a close and respected relative were annoying me, I would rather smother my feelings than express my annoyance. *

    **Very Uncharacteristic**  **Very Characteristic**
    
    1 2 3 4 5 6

12. I have avoided asking questions for fear of sounding stupid. *

    **Very Uncharacteristic**  **Very Characteristic**
    
    1 2 3 4 5 6
13. During an argument I am sometimes afraid that I will get so upset that I will shake all over*

Very Uncharacteristic  Very Characteristic
1 2 3 4 5 6

14. If a famed and respected lecturer makes a statement which I think is incorrect, I will have the audience hear my point of view as well.

Very Uncharacteristic  Very Characteristic
1 2 3 4 5 6

15. If someone has been spreading false and bad stories about me, I see him/her as possible to “have a talk” about it.

Very Uncharacteristic  Very Characteristic
1 2 3 4 5 6

16. I often have a hard time saying “No.” *

Very Uncharacteristic  Very Characteristic
1 2 3 4 5 6

17. I complain about poor service in a restaurant and elsewhere.

Very Uncharacteristic  Very Characteristic
1 2 3 4 5 6

18. When I am given a compliment, I sometimes just don’t know what to say. *

Very Uncharacteristic  Very Characteristic
1 2 3 4 5 6
19. If a couple near me in a theater or at a lecture were conversing rather loudly, I would ask them to be quiet or to take their conversation elsewhere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Uncharacteristic</th>
<th>Very Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. I am quick to express an opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Uncharacteristic</th>
<th>Very Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates item is reversed scored.
APPENDIX H

AGREEABLENESS SCALE

(+)

1. Have a good word for everyone.
   
   Inaccurate 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very Accurate

2. Believe that others have good intentions.

   Inaccurate 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very Accurate

3. Respect others.

   Inaccurate 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very Accurate

4. Accept people as they are.

   Inaccurate 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very Accurate

5. Make people feel at ease.

   Inaccurate 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very Accurate

6. Am concerned about others.

   Inaccurate 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very Accurate

7. Trust what people say.

   Inaccurate 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very Accurate

8. Sympathize with others’ feelings.

   Inaccurate 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very Accurate

9. Am easy to satisfy.

   Inaccurate 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very Accurate
10. Treat all people equally.

*Inaccurate* 1 2 3 4 5 6 *Very Accurate*

(-)

11. Have a sharp tongue.

*Inaccurate* 1 2 3 4 5 6 *Very Accurate*

12. Cut others to pieces.

*Inaccurate* 1 2 3 4 5 6 *Very Accurate*

13. Suspect hidden motives in others.

*Inaccurate* 1 2 3 4 5 6 *Very Accurate*

14. Get back at others.

*Inaccurate* 1 2 3 4 5 6 *Very Accurate*

15. Insult people.

*Inaccurate* 1 2 3 4 5 6 *Very Accurate*

16. Believe that I am better than others.

*Inaccurate* 1 2 3 4 5 6 *Very Accurate*

17. Contradict others.

*Inaccurate* 1 2 3 4 5 6 *Very Accurate*

18. Make demands on others.

*Inaccurate* 1 2 3 4 5 6 *Very Accurate*

19. Hold a grudge.

*Inaccurate* 1 2 3 4 5 6 *Very Accurate*

20. Am out for my own personal gain.

*Inaccurate* 1 2 3 4 5 6 *Very Accurate*

(+) indicates positively scored items, (-) indicates negatively scored item.