2010

Examining Intimate Partner Stalking And Use Of Technology In Stalking Victimization

Jennifer Truman
University of Central Florida

EXAMINING INTIMATE PARTNER STALKING AND USE OF TECHNOLOGY IN STALKING VICTIMIZATION

by

JENNIFER LYNN TRUMAN
M.A. University of Central Florida, 2007

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Sociology
in the College of Sciences
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term
2010

Major Professor: Jana L. Jasinski

ABSTRACT

This research was designed to expand the empirical knowledge and understanding of stalking victimization by examining both intimate and nonintimate stalking and the use of technology to stalk. To accomplish this, the current research examined differences among intimate and nonintimate stalking, stalking types (cyberstalking, stalking with technology, and traditional stalking), and stalking types by the victim-offender relationship. Specifically, this research examined demographic differences, differences in severity, seriousness, victim reactions and responses to and effects of stalking. Findings revealed that overall intimate partner stalking victims experienced greater levels of seriousness and severity of stalking, and expressed more fear than nonintimate partner stalking victims. Additionally, they were more likely to have engaged in self-protective or help-seeking actions. With regard to stalking type, victims who were cyberstalked and stalked with technology experienced a greater variety of stalking behaviors, were more likely to define the behaviors as stalking, and took more actions to protect themselves than victims who were traditionally stalked. Moreover, those who were stalked with technology experienced a greater severity of stalking. And when examining differences among stalking types by the victim-offender relationship, intimate partner stalking victims were still more likely than nonintimate partner stalking victims to have experienced a greater severity of stalking. This research contributed to existing research by being the first to examine cyberstalking and stalking with technology with a national dataset, and adding to the knowledge of differences between intimate and nonintimate partner stalking. Implications for policy and for research are discussed.

To mom and dad, thank you for your constant love and support. Thank you for always encouraging me to pursue my dreams and believing in everything that I do.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To Dr. Jana Jasinski, my dissertation chair and mentor: For always having an open door and being there to answer questions and offer advice. You have been a constant source of encouragement since I came to UCF. You are always there to offer support, guidance, and restore confidence. The time and effort that you invest in helping your students is truly incredible and immensely appreciated. Thank you for encouraging me to enter this program, you are the main reason I made the decision to continue on, and it is a decision I will never regret.

To my dissertation committee members, Drs. Elizabeth Mustaine, Jim Wright, and Hugh Potter: Thank you for your expertise and guidance throughout this process. I appreciate the time, advice, and opportunities that each of you have provided throughout my career. I am always grateful for your willingness to provide support whenever I needed it.

To Nathan: Thank you for your unwavering love and support through all of this. You are always there to encourage me when I need it the most. Thank you for always believing in me and convincing me that I should believe in myself.

To Michele and Chastity, my cohort: This has been quite a journey and I am so glad to have gone through it with you all by my side. Thank you for always being available for impromptu phone calls and texts, therapy sessions, and study sessions. And let's not forget our mantra. I look forward to our continued friendship in the years to come.

To Amy: You are an amazing woman and friend. Thank you for the support, advice, camaraderie, empathy and laughter that you have provided throughout this journey. I am so thankful that we have had so many opportunities to work together and look forward to continuing to do so. I have learned so much from you and I admire your passion for all that you do. I look forward to our future reunions and continued friendship.

To Monica and Rae: You are incredible women and have made this journey so much more bearable. Rae, you predicted I would be back in the fall, and here I am at the end! Thank you for your constant support, advice, laughter, and compassion. I look forward to future collaborations, reunions at conferences, and a lifetime of friendship.

To Courtney: For always being there to listen and offer advice. Thank you for your love and support through this whole process

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Stalking has been deemed a significant social problem. In the United States alone, it is estimated that over three million people will have experienced stalking each year (Baum, Catalano, Rand, & Rose, 2009). Stalking is a crime of intimidation and psychological fear that often has devastating consequences for victims (NCVC, 2007). Unlike other crimes, stalking does not occur on a single occasion and victims experience multiple stalking behaviors (Sheridan, Blaauw, & Davies, 2003). Victims of stalking may experience direct effects, such as physical, emotional or psychological harm, declines in health, stress of ongoing fear, anger, or insomnia; as well as disruptions in their social and/or institutional networks (Bjerregaard, 2000; Brewster, 1999; Davis, Coker, & Sanderson, 2002; Fisher Cullen, & Turner, 2000, 2002; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2007; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998b; USDOJ, 2001). Victims of stalking also may have to significantly alter their lives and be disrupted from performing everyday tasks, such as answering the phone and reading mail, out of fear. And in addition to the significant impact stalking has on a victim, it may also put them at risk for further violence (McFarlane, et al.1999, 2002).

Stalking behaviors have existed for centuries, but laws preventing stalking are less than two decades old. As such, the body of research is small, but has continued to grow and provide more perspective on many aspects of stalking. Still, there is much to learn. The two main areas in which the literature needs to be further developed are intimate partner stalking and cyberstalking. Further since the literature has mostly been descriptive, there has been little application of theory. This study builds on the current research and fills in the existing gaps by exploring both intimate partner stalking and cyberstalking.

Using the National Crime Victimization Survey: Stalking Victimization Supplement (United States Department of Justice (USDOJ), Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), 2009) this study examined demographic differences of victims, differences in severity, length and frequency of stalking, victim reactions and responses to and effects of stalking by stalking type and victim-offender relationship. Due to the gendered nature of stalking, a feminist perspective was used. The most heavily cited national data on stalking is now over ten years old and does not include data on cyberstalking (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998a, 1998b, 2000a). The data for the present study are the most recent national data on stalking and the first national data to examine cyberstalking. The current study adds to the existing research on stalking victimization by examining both intimate and nonintimate stalking and the behavior of cyberstalking. Both of these areas have important implications as stalking victimization is most likely to have been committed by someone the victim knows, specifically most often an intimate partner. And with the growth of technology comes the escalation of cyberstalking victimization. Hence, it remains important to examine these types and patterns of stalking to help better understand the crime and be able to better assist victims.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Defining Stalking

The first anti-stalking law was passed in California in 1990 (National Center for Victims of Crime (NCVC), 2007; National Institute of Justice (NIJ), 1996). This law was in response to the murder of actress Rebecca Schaeffer, who was killed by an obsessed fan who stalked her for two years (McAnaney, Curliss, Abeyta-Price, 1993; NCVC, 2007). In addition, the law was also a reaction to the murder of five women, all of whom were killed by harassers against whom they had previously obtained restraining orders (McAnaney, et al., 1993; NCVC, 2007). These cases brought the seriousness of stalking to the attention of the public, and by 1992 there was a surge of anti-stalking legislation (McAnaney, et al., 1993). Today, all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the federal government have anti-stalking laws; and in some states the harassment laws also include stalking (Miller, 2002; Office of Victims of Crime (OVC), 2002). Overall, in most states stalking is a misdemeanor except in certain conditions, like the violation of a protective order (OVC, 2002).

In general, stalking is defined as a willful or intentional pattern of recurring behaviors (usually two or more times) directed towards a specific individual(s) that are unwelcome and intrusive, and would cause a reasonable person to fear or view them as threatening (Miller, 2002; OVC, 2002; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2007; Westrup & Fremouw, 1998). Most states have removed the "credible threat" requirement, as it is now recognized that stalkers generally present an implied (perhaps not credible) threat to their victims (OVC, 2002). Hence, under most states' stalking laws a threat may be either explicit or implicit (Miller, 2002). In fact, a national survey

showed that less than half of all stalking victims were directly threatened by their pursuers (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998b). In addition, stalking laws typically require that the unwanted pursuit would cause a "reasonable" person to experience fear (OVC, 2002).

A new area of stalking that has been recently addressed is the issue of cyberstalking – engaging in stalking behaviors using electronic communication (OVC, 2002; U.S. Department of Justice (USDOJ), Violence Against Women Office, 2001). Many states have now begun to incorporate cyberstalking into the stalking or harassment laws and statutes (OVC, 2002). Congress made interstate stalking a federal offense in 1996, and it was later amended to include stalking via electronic communications (NCVC, 2007). Furthermore, an amendment in 2006 expanded stalking to also include the surveillance of a victim by global positioning system (GPS) (NCVC, 2007). The information and research we have regarding cyberstalking is new, and this means there is still much we do not know. This study adds to the knowledge base about cyberstalking and first reviews what we do know so far about cyberstalking below.

Prevalence of Stalking

Generally, there are a variety of legal elements that make up the crime of stalking. This makes it difficult to provide a good estimation of the prevalence of stalking (Davis & Frieze, 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2007). Nevertheless, some researchers have offered national estimations using self-report data (e.g. Baum et al., 2009; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998a, 1998b, 2000a). The National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS) estimated that about 1.4 million people experienced stalking over a 12-month period (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998a, 1998b, 2000a). And the more recent National Crime Victimization Survey: Stalking Victimization Supplement estimated that in a year approximately 3.4 million people will experience stalking

with 1 in 4 of these victims experiencing some form of cyberstalking (Baum et al., 2009). Interestingly, it does appear that stalking victimization rates have increased over the last ten years. However, direct comparison of the surveys may not be possible as the methods of these surveys were different, and the definition of a stalking victim varied to some extent. Although one must recognize that these estimates do not take into account those under the age of 18, homeless, or living in facilities that would not have been accessed for research (i.e. institutions, group facilities, households without telephones); therefore, these numbers likely underestimate the actual amount of stalking victimization (Baum et al., 2009; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998a, 1998b, 2000a). Prevalence rates among college populations, a group that may be at high risk of stalking, average around 10% (Bopp, 2005; Coleman, 1997; Fisher et al., 2000, 2002; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1999). And cyberstalking victimization rates vary from 4 to 15% (Alexy et al., 2005; Finn, 2004).

Characteristics of Stalking

Gender and Stalking

Stalking has been referred to as a gender-neutral crime; yet stalking cases generally involve female victims and male perpetrators (Bjerregaard, 2000; Davis & Frieze, 2000; Sheridan et al., 2001a; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998; Tjaden et al., 2000). In fact, the NVAW Survey indicated the majority of stalking victims are female (78%) and most stalking perpetrators are male (87%) (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). Generally, samples from college campuses also show this pattern (Bjerregaard, 2000; Davis & Frieze, 2000; Fremouw et al., 1997; Haugaard & Seri, 2003; McCreedy & Dennis, 1996). Interestingly, college men are

significantly more likely than college women to have been cyberstalked (Alexy et al., 2005). However, some studies do not consistently find these gender differences (e.g. Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Palarea, Cohen, & Rohling, 2000; Davis & Frieze, 2000). Perhaps these inconsistent findings may be related to how stalking was defined and assessed. Furthermore, some suggest that these findings may be explained by the idea that the same behaviors are assessed differently depending on gender (Davis & Frieze, 2000). Specifically, when a man engages in stalking behaviors, the behaviors may be taken more seriously by a woman than when a woman engages in similar behaviors towards a man (Davis & Frieze, 2000). Furthermore, research supports this notion, that is, when asked to identify whether or not a behavior (e.g. consistently being followed to work, receiving multiple hang-up phone calls) was stalking, females were more likely than males to identify the specific behavior as stalking and perceive that the accused intended to cause fear and harm (Dennison & Thomson, 2002).

Relationship between the Pursued and Their Pursuers

One of the stereotypes of stalking is that it is a violent crime that is stranger-perpetrated or committed in pursuit of a celebrity with directly threatening behaviors or violence (Davis & Frieze, 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2007). In general, the relationship between stalkers and their victims may be characterized as intimates or former intimates, acquaintances, or strangers (NIJ, 1996). Moreover, most stalking evolves out of relationships (Bjerregaard, 2000; Fisher et al., 2000, 2002; Fremouw et al., 1997; NIJ, 1996; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2007; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998b). The majority of stalking occurs in situations in which the pursuer and pursued shared some degree of acquaintance (Baum et al., 2009; Bjerregaard, 2000; Fisher et al., 2000, 2002; Fremouw et al., 1997; Sheridan et al., 2001a; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2007; Tjaden & Thoennes,

1998b). And a recent meta-analysis of stalking studies estimated that about 80% of stalkers were known to the victim (Spitzberg & Cupach, 2007). More specifically, about half of stalking emerges from romantic relationships, and this is particularly common among college students (Fisher et al., 2000, 2002; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2007). Those who are cyberstalked are more likely to have had this done by a former intimate partner than others who were stalked (Alexy et al., 2005). Like stalking in general, women are more likely than men to be stalked by an intimate partner (Fremouw et al., 1997; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998b). Overall, contrary to the media portrayed image of a stranger stalker, stalking incidents generally occur among acquaintances or intimates.

Consequences of Stalking

Stalking is a crime of intimidation and psychological fear that can often have devastating consequences for victims (NCVC, 2007). Victims of stalking may experience direct effects, such as emotional or psychological harm, declines in health, stress of ongoing fear, anger, or insomnia (Bjerregaard, 2000; Brewster, 1999; Davis et al., 2002; Fisher et al., 2000, 2002; Melton, 2007c; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2007; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998b; USDOJ, Violence Against Women Office, 2001). Cyberstalking has also been found to be just as detrimental to victims as other forms of stalking (Gregorie, 2001). Female victims express greater fear than male victims (Bjerregaard, 2000). Additionally, victims may also experience disruptions in their social and/or institutional networks (Spitzberg & Cupach, 2007; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998b). Stalking victims have also reported that they have lost time at work due to their victimization (Baum et al., 2009; Mechanic et al., 2000b; Melton, 2007c; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998b). Victims may also incur some financial cost as a result of being stalked, such as having to move,

changing or adding locks, or legal fees (Baum et al., 2009; Brewster, 1999; Melton, 2007c; USDOJ, Violence Against Women Office, 2001). And further, those who help victims may themselves become targets of the stalker or be negatively affected by the stalking (Sheridan et al., 2001a; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2007). Moreover, some have found that being stalked is associated with substance abuse for both women and men (Davis et al., 2002). Research also indicates that there is a negative mental health effect of stalking (Brewster, 1999, 2002; Davis et al., 2002; Fisher et al., 2000, 2002; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998b). And some stalking victims seek psychological counseling or support due to their stalking victimization (Brewster, 1999; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998b; Westrup et al., 1999). By and large, victims of stalking experience a decrease in the quality of their lives (Brewster, 1999).

While research has developed on consequences of stalking in general, we still know little about the consequences of cyberstalking. There has also been little research that has focused on the specific effects of being stalked by an intimate partner (Melton, 2007a). The current research addresses these inadequacies and explores the impact of stalking comparing nonintimate to intimate stalking and cyberstalking to non-cyberstalking.

Reactions to Stalking

National estimates indicate that close to half of female and male victims report stalking to the police (Baum et al., 2009; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998b). However, unlike the national sample, among college students, over 80% of victims did not report the incidents to the police or campus law enforcement officials (Fisher et al., 2002; Haugaard & Seri, 2003; Jordan et al, 2007; Karjane, Fisher, & Cullen, 2002). Overall, victims give multiple reasons for not reporting stalking. For example, victims felt that their stalking victimization was not a police matter or it

was not seriousness enough to report, the police would not be able to do anything or they would not take it seriously, or they fear retaliation from their stalkers (Fisher et al., 2002; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998b). Interestingly, victims of cyberstalking in particular were more likely than other victims not to do something because they thought that it would stop (Alexy et al., 2005). Furthermore, related to gender, females are more likely than males to report their stalking victimization (Bjerregaard, 2000). Overall, reporting stalking victimization is generally low; but victims engage in other actions to cope with their victimization.

Victims of stalking may sometimes find it difficult to find effective means to deter their pursuers (Spitzberg & Cupach, 2007). For example, some victims have reported that if they seek help from the police and obtain a protective or restraining order, the pursuer does not comply or the pursuit gets worse (Brewster, 1999; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2007; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998b). Additionally, victims may also seek help from other outlets, such as family, friends, victim service agencies, and such; and these groups likely provide them with many different recommendations for handling their situations (Alexy et al., 2005; Bjerregaard, 2000; Brewster, 1999; Fisher et al., 2002; Haugaard & Seri, 2003; USDOJ, Violence Against Women Office, 2001). Coping strategies of victims may include negotiating with, threatening or even confronting the pursuer, avoiding or ignoring the stalker, moving away (i.e. change address, blocking phone numbers, dropping a class), engaging in denial, or seeking assistance or support (Alexy et al., 2005; Bjerregaard, 2000; Brewster, 1999; Fisher et al., 2000, 2002; Fremouw et al., 1997; NCVC, 2007; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2007; USDOJ, Violence Against Women Office, 2001). And, likely these types of strategies have differing levels of success. In any event, victims may find they are uncertain how to best handle the ongoing victimization they are

experiencing. This research further adds to the literature on reactions to stalking victimization by examining reactions based on type of stalking and victim-offender relationship.

Stalking in the Context of Intimate Partner Violence

A recent review on intimate partner stalking suggests that it may be "one of the least clearly understood forms of intimate violence" (Logan & Walker, 2009, p. 247). And research on stalking prevalence among an intimate partner violence population has just begun (Melton, 2007a). Experiences of stalking in the context of intimate partner violence are widespread (Melton, 2004; Mechanic et al., 2000b; Roberts, 2005). For these reasons it is important for research to examine intimate partner stalking. The following is an overview of what we know so far and what this study can add to the existing research.

Patterns of Intimate Partner Stalking

Intimate partner stalkers employ various methods or behaviors including, but not limited to physically watching or following at both work and home, making unwanted calls, sending unwanted letters, or making threats of harm (Burgess et al., 1997; Mechanic et al., 2000b; Melton, 2007c). Some stalkers have also had others they know stalk their victims too or what Melton (2007c) refers to as "proxy stalking" (p. 356). The use of others to stalk further extends the abusers control over their victim (Melton, 2007c). Intimate partner stalkers also threatened or sometimes even harmed their victims' new partners (Melton, 2007b). It is important for research to examine the likelihood that there may be subtypes of stalking, especially when comparing stranger stalking with intimate partner stalking (Mechanic et al., 2000b). The current research study adds to the research by determining if the types of behaviors that victims are

experiencing differ based on their relationship with their stalkers. In addition to examining the types of behaviors being experienced, it is also important to consider the motivations for the stalking behaviors.

Women who were stalked by their intimate partners felt that control, anger, and jealously were all motivations of their partners' or ex-partners' behaviors (Melton, 2007c). Interestingly some women report that they felt like their stalkers were stalking them out of love or concern for them (Melton, 2007c). In addition to what victims think, research has also looked at motivations for stalking behaviors and has found that stalking may be motivated by efforts to control or intimidate the victim (Brewster, 2003; Mechanic et al., 2000b). It has been suggested that stalking may be another form of dominance and control when occurring in a physically violent relationship (Mechanic et al., 2000b). Intimate partner stalkers used power and control tactics to convince their victims to stay in the relationship or try to reestablish the relationship once it ended (Brewster, 2003). As the stalking literature within the context of intimate partner violence is so new, again, it remains important to further examine why abusers commit these acts. This study adds to this by examining what the victims of intimate partner thought with regard to their victimization (i.e. why they were targeted).

Differences between Intimate Partner Stalking and Stranger Stalking

Logan and Walker (2009) suggest that there are multiple ways that intimate partner stalking is different from nonintimate partner stalking. There is first a relationship history between the victim and offender and the intimacy involved may affect the victim's interpretation of the behaviors (Logan et al., 2006; Melton, 2000). And many times the prior relationship is characterized by abuse (Brewster, 1999, 2003; Coleman, 1997, McFarlane et al., 2002). Due to

this relationship history, intimate partner stalkers tend to have a wider range of stalking behaviors as they have more personal knowledge of their victims (Logan et al., 2006; Sheridan & Davies, 2001). Intimate partner stalkers are also more likely than stranger stalkers to threaten their victims and actually engage in violence (Melton, 2000; Sheridan & Davies, 2001; Wright et al., 1996). Nonintimate partner stalking may be characterized by an array of unwanted behaviors of mostly non-physical contact; whereas, intimate partner violence certainly may involve physical contact (Mechanic et al., 2000b). Further stalking behaviors by intimate partners have been found to begin or occur throughout relationship and continue after the relationship ends (Brewster, 1999, 2003; Logan et al., 2006; Melton, 2007c; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998b). And others have found that intimate partner stalkers typically continue stalking for longer periods of time (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998b). Lastly, intimate partner stalking may be a source of greater psychological distress (Brewster, 2002; Logan & Cole, 2007; Logan et al., 2006). And unfortunately it has been suggested that intimate partner stalking is generally taken less seriously than cases of stranger or acquaintance stalking (Phillips et al., 2004; Sheridan et al., 2003). The differing characteristics of intimate partner stalking may have implications for both prevention and intervention efforts (Melton, 2007a). And this current study further adds to the discussion of the differences between nonintimate and intimate partner stalking by examining severity, length and frequency of stalking, victim reactions and responses, and effects of stalking.

Prevalence and Nature of Intimate Partner Stalking

One of the debates within the literature on intimate partner stalking is whether stalking is a variant of intimate partner violence or a continuation of intimate partner violence (Logan & Walker, 2009; Melton, 2007a). Researchers have examined the association between physical

violence and stalking, in addition to the onset of the stalking behaviors (Melton, 2007a). The perception is that if stalking is a variant of intimate partner violence, stalking behaviors would be found throughout the relationship (Melton, 2007a). And if it is a continuation of intimate partner violence, the stalking behaviors would commence after the relationship comes to an end (Melton, 2007a).

With regard to evidence related to this discussion, some studies have found that stalking occurs throughout the relationship (Brewster, 1999; Melton, 2007c; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998b). And this may suggest that stalking is a variant of intimate partner violence (Logan et al., 2000; Melton, 2007c). A further argument has been made that stalking is an extension of the power and control that had began within the relationship (Brewster, 2003). And still others find that the stalking or intrusive contact begins after the dissolution of the relationship, perhaps as an angry reaction to the breakup (Dye & Davis, 2003; Haugaard & Seri, 2003; Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2000; Logan et al., 2000; Mechanic et al., 2000a; Sheridan et al., 2001a). It appears that the stalking intensifies and abusers may move to more violent and sometimes physical tactics after the relationship ends (Logan et al., 2000; Mechanic et al., 2000b; Melton, 2007c). These research findings suggests that stalking may rather be a continuation of intimate partner violence as their research finds that stalking either starts or intensifies after the conclusion of the relationship (Burgess et al., 1997; Mechanic et al., 2000a). Clearly there is a need for more research to help to clarify this debate. Logan and Walker (2009) suggest that there are multiple reasons for the debate of whether intimate partner stalking is unique or if it is a continuation of abuse. These reasons include the variation of defining stalking within the research, which causes difficulties when trying to make comparisons (Logan & Walker, 2009). Further, Logan and

Walker (2009) suggest that research should not treat stalking simplistically, but see it as a course of conduct, and not only focus on tactics but focus also on aspects such as duration or intensity. Perhaps the current study may offer some evidence to support either notion as this study examines intimate partner violence and can determine if the stalking began while the abuser was still living with the victim.

Associations between Intimate Partner Stalking and Other Violence

Few have examined factors that may predict intimate partner stalking (Melton, 2007a). Some find that stalking is associated with more severe physical, sexual, and emotional abuse (Logan, Shannon, & Cole, 2007; Mechanic et al., 2000a). And a prior history of physical or psychological abuse has been found to be a good predictor of stalking (Burgess et al., 1997; Davis et al., 2000; Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2000; Logan et al., 2000; Melton, 2007b, 2007c). Those victims who had experienced stalking in their relationships have a higher risk of experiencing more stalking by their partner (Melton, 2007b). Associations have also been found between stalking, verbal, and physical abuse in intimate relationships (Coleman, 1997; Davis et al., 2000; Logan & Cole, 2007; Logan et al., 2000; McFarlane et al., 1999, 2002; Mechanic et al., 2000a; Mechanic et al., 2000b; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000b; White et al., 2000). Overall, many abused women experience some level of stalking behavior (Melton, 2004). Some have found that stalking is more highly associated with emotional or psychological abuse than physical abuse (Mechanic et al., 2000b). Controlling behaviors were also predictive of stalking as victims who experienced these behaviors also experienced more severe stalking behaviors (Melton, 2007b). Other significant predictors of violence during stalking are direct threats of violence, jealously of partner's relationship with others, and drug use (Roberts, 2005). Stalking has also

been found to be related to victims' fears of future violence, which certainly appears justified (Mechanic et al., 2000a; Mechanic et al., 2000b).

Further, research has found that the majority of femicide victims had been stalked (McFarlane et al., 1999, 2002). It appears then that stalking may be a risk factor for lethal intimate partner violence (Coleman, 1997; McFarlane et al., 1999, 2002). One study has also found that women who were severely stalked (i.e. extreme frequency of an array of stalking behaviors) were also subjected to life-threatening violence, which again may point to the concern that stalking is a possible risk factor for lethality (Mechanic et al., 2000a). Overall, research suggests that stalking is a significant risk factor for other forms of violence, including lethal violence, in victims' relationships. And yet, research has only recently begun to explore predictors of stalking and its associations with other forms of violence. The current research addresses this issue further by examining possible predictors of intimate partner stalking compared to stalking by a nonintimate partner. Additionally, because the data are part of a larger victimization survey, this study also examines associations between stalking and other forms of violence.

Cyberstalking

A New Form of Stalking

As previously mentioned, cyberstalking is engaging in stalking behaviors using electronic communication devices (OVC, 2002; United States Department of Justice (USDOJ), 1999; USDOJ, Violence Against Women Office, 2001). Cyberstalkers employ various methods, including monitoring victim's e-mail, sending threatening e-mails or text messages, seeking

victims' personal information on the Internet to use for harassment, and monitoring the victim's behaviors with electronic devices such as Global Positioning Systems (GPS) (D'Ovidio & Doyle, 2003; Finn & Banach, 2000; Gregorie, 2001; Ogilvie, 2000a, 2000b; Spitzberg & Hoobler, 2002). The most common form used is generally e-mail (Baum et al., 2009; D'Ovidio & Doyle, 2003; Finn, 2004; Ogilvie, 2000a). Stalkers no longer have to be in close proximity to pursue their victims (NCVS, 20078; USDOJ, 1999; USDOJ, Violence Against Women Office, 2001). There has been some discussion as to whether cyberstalking is a unique form of stalking distinct from "offline" stalking (Bocij, 2003, 2004) or whether technology has simply provided additional tools for stalkers to use, that is, cyberstalking is just one more technique used (Burgess & Baker, 2002; Gregorie, 2001; Sheridan & Grant, 2007; Spitzberg & Hoobler, 2002; USDOJ, 1999). One could suggest that cyberstalking may also be a precursor to offline stalking (i.e. traditional stalking).

Some major advantages for cyberstalkers are that cyberstalking allows the stalker to be located essentially anywhere, including across the country or world, provides more anonymity, and does not include direct confrontation with the victim (D'Ovidio & Doyle, 2003; NCVC, 2007; USDOJ, 1999; USDOJ, Violence Against Women Office, 2001). All of these factors may decrease potential barriers to committing stalking (Finn, 2004; USDOJ, 1999; USDOJ, Violence Against Women Office, 2001). In particular, the anonymity of cyberstalking may increase its attraction to stalkers and increase fear among victims (USDOJ, 1999; USDOJ, Violence Against Women Office, 2001). Victims may feel as if all of their means of communication are tainted by the risk of further victimization (Spitzberg & Hoobler, 2002). Victims can essentially be stalked from anywhere and feel that their private life is no longer private.

Overall, it appears that cyberstalking has similar characteristics to other forms of stalking (Sheridan & Grant, 2007). Here too, most victims are women and most offenders are men (D'Ovidio & Doyle, 2003; Moriarty & Freiberger, 2008; Sheridan & Grant, 2007; USDOJ, 1999; USDOJ, Violence Against Women Office, 2001), although recent research has found that college men were at times more likely to have been cyberstalked than college women (Alexy et al., 2005). With regard to victim-offender relationship, some find that cyberstalking is just as likely to occur among former intimates, and may begin at the dissolution of a relationship (Alexy et al., 2005; USDOJ, 1999; USDOJ, Violence Against Women Office, 2001). And others find that cyberstalkers were less likely to be ex-intimate partners or know to the victim (Bocij, 2003, 2004; Finn, 2004; Moriarty & Freiberger, 2008; Sheridan & Grant, 2007). Perhaps this is a reflection of the anonymous nature of cyberstalking too in that victims may not think they know their cyberstalker when it really may be an acquaintance or intimate partner. The current study adds to this discussion of whether those who are cyberstalked are more or less likely to be stalked by an intimate partner.

Furthermore, the effects of cyberstalking on victims are found to be similar to other forms of stalking (Bocij, 2004; Sheridan & Grant, 2007). In fact, the anonymity of cyberstalking may actually be one of the most threatening features of this particular crime (Gregorie, 2001). This proves to be important as it shows that stalking does not have to involve direct contact or physical in order to negatively impact victims (Gregorie, 2001; Sheridan & Grant, 2007). Overall, it is important to have research related to the differences between cyberstalking and other forms of stalking. And further research is needed to examine similarities and dissimilarities between stalking and cyberstalking and to examine to whether one type of stalking

may lead to the other (Finn, 2004). Unfortunately due to the survey design, the current study may not be able to determine if cyberstalking was a unique form of stalking that either came before or after other forms of stalking. Yet, the current research certainly adds to the literature by being able to examine differences among cyberstalking versus non-cyberstalking. This alone is important as the current study uses a national dataset and no other study has been able to examine cyberstalking nationally.

Technology and Stalking

As the Internet and related information technologies continue to advance, so does the concern over cyberstalking. The Internet has continued to grow from its inception, and currently the Pew Internet and American Life Project estimates that 79% of the adult population uses the Internet (Pew Internet and American Life Project, 2009a). The Internet has become an essential part of both personal and professional life. Further, the ways in which people use the Internet continue to expand.

People use the Internet for various activities, including sending and receiving e-mail, buying products, looking for jobs, or keeping in touch with friends and family through update services (e.g. Twitter) or social networking sites (e.g. Facebook) (Pew Internet and American Life Project, 2009b). Social networking sites such as MySpace and Facebook are virtual communities where people share information about themselves with others, including photos. Social networking usage has increased from 8% in 2005 to 35% in 2008 (Lenhart, 2009; Pew Internet and American Life Project, 2009c). And the most likely users are young adults (ages 18-24) with about 75% of this group using social networking sites (Lenhart, 2009). Social networking sites are arguably perfect places for stalkers to find information about their victims or

post harassing material (Singh, 2008; Stalking Resource Center, 2009). Although these sites have the ability for users to make their information private and only allow their "friends" to see their information, members of these sites actually have to exercise these options. And the young adults who are most likely to use these sites may overlook the potential dangers of these sites and not think twice about posting personal information. Also, people may allow casual acquaintances access to their pages, not necessarily knowing their intentions. Furthermore, if one's stalker was a "friend" (or intimate partner) at one time, this may not protect victims. The user may be able to block those they no longer want to view their page, but it may be too late. There is certainly a fine line between what might be considered normal social networking and cyberstalking. In fact, there has been media coverage of those who are self-proclaimed "Facebook stalkers," that is, they constantly look through their "friends" pages to see updates on what they are doing and so forth (Dubow, 2007). Certainly, these acts may not necessarily cross the line of cyberstalking as there may not be any threats or harassment being committed. However, there have been anecdotal accounts of those who have used social networking sites to obtain information to locate and stalk people (Stalking Resource Center, 2009). Overall, with the increasing usage of the Internet and its various forms of communication, especially among certain age groups, it is important to continue to address this form of stalking (Finn, 2004). Furthermore, with the continued growth of Internet usage there is also the potential for the growth of advanced methods for stalkers to use to commit their crime.

There is a plethora of personal information that is available online, readily accessible by anyone, including stalkers. There are many reference sites that when searched simultaneously pull detailed information about people from public records or various other sites, such as social

networking sites (e.g. PeekYou, www.peekyou.com; 123people, www.123people.com). If stalkers want information about their victims, they could simply put the victim's name into one of these sites or even a basic search engine like Google (www.google.com) and they will be bombarded with whatever information is available online about that person. This information could range from city location to a link to one's social networking site to address and social security number. Clearly, if one wants to find information about someone online, there is a good chance the information is "out there." And cyberstalkers can simply gather information about their victim, use it to find their victim, or even commit identity theft against the victim (Finn & Banach, 2000; Spence-Diehl, 2003). While these technologies may not have been designed to enhance a stalkers reach, they certainly can be used to do so, and it is important that this be recognized.

Communication and electronic technologies continue to grow as well and so does stalkers' use of these methods. Cell phones and text messaging are yet other variations that allow one to contact and perhaps harass someone else easily. In particular, text messaging (short messaging service or SMS) allows the stalker to not have any direct contact (Eytan & Borras, 2005). Also, both caller ID telephone service and fax machine print information have been used to track victims (Southworth et al., 2005, 2007; Tucker et al., 2005). And TTY telephones that are supposed to be used by the hearing impaired are also being used by stalkers to monitor and impersonate victims (Southworth et al., 2005, 2007; Tucker et al., 2005). Global Positioning Systems (GPS) have also begun to be used to track and monitor victims' movements (NCVC, 2007; Southworth et al., 2005, 2007; Stalking Resource Center, 2003; Tucker et al., 2005). This type of abuse has become especially prevalent among intimate partner stalking cases (Jenkins,

2007; Miller, 2009; Southworth et al., 2005, 2007; Tessier, 2006; Tucker et al., 2005). Yet even though methods of stalking may be changed, it is argued that the purpose to gain power and control over victims remains (Tucker et al., 2005). Furthermore, computer technology spy ware and keystroke logging hardware (both allow monitoring of online activity) have been used by stalkers and intimate partner abusers to monitor their victims' online activity (Southworth et al., 2005, 2007; Tucker et al., 2005). Unfortunately it appears that the same technology that affords victims of crime the ability to simply access information and resources may also in turn increase their risk for online victimization, including cyberstalking (Finn & Banach, 2000; Southworth et al., 2005, 2007; Tucker et al., 2005). And it appears that as technology continues to increase, so will the means for stalkers to pursue their victims.

What We Currently Know and Need to Know About Cyberstalking

Cyberstalking is a fairly new crime, and hence, the research is certainly incomplete, but growing. Overall, it could be argued that there is a dearth of data on cyberstalking, in fact, until recently there was no comprehensive, nationwide data on cyberstalking in the United States (USDOJ, BJS, 2009; USDOJ, 1999; USDOJ, Violence Against Women Office, 2001). And even so, this national data is already arguably outdated as it relates to cyberstalking as some of the technologies being used to cyberstalk (e.g. text messaging, social networking sites) are not even mentioned on the survey as they were not prevalent when the survey was created (Baum, 2009).

Recent national estimates suggest that about a quarter of stalking victims experience some form of cyberstalking, with the most common involving e-mail (Baum et al., 2009). Other studies have also found that e-mailing and instant messaging are the most common forms of harassment (D'Ovidio & Doyle, 2003; Finn, 2004). Stalking may vary by methods used, such as

online stalking (e.g. unwanted e-mailing) or electronic monitoring (e.g. GPS to monitor). There could be a difference between cyberstalking (or online stalking) and electronic monitoring (or stalking with technology-based tools, such as GPS). This research will explore if such a difference exists. The perpetrator in most cases is known to the victim, as with other forms of stalking (Alexy et al., 2005; USDOJ, 1999; USDOJ, Violence Against Women Office, 2001); yet some have found contradictory evidence suggesting that most perpetrators are unknown to the victim (Bocij, 2003, 2004; Finn, 2004; Moriarty & Freiberger, 2008; Sheridan & Grant, 2007). This is one area in which there is a debate, and where the current study will add more information. It will also be important to see if there is an association between cyberstalking and other types of interpersonal violence (Finn, 2004). And again, this research can offer some examination of possible associations of stalking with other types of violence. Overall, cyberstalking is a concern and research has only scratched the surface of the topic.

There has been a call for further research into the connection between technology and stalking (Spence-Diehl, 2003). And more specifically, there has been a call for further research into the use of technology in intimate partner stalking (Southworth et al., 2005, 2007). It is also imperative to obtain generalizable results to understand the exact scope and nature of cyberstalking (Southworth et al., 2005, 2007; Spence-Diehl, 2003). There have been no nationally representative studies that explore technologies used in intimate partner stalking (Southworth et al., 2005). Spence-Diehl (2003) points out that it is important to know if cyberstalking is used as a precursor to offline stalking, or if it is used in combination with offline stalking, or if it is the only method of stalking being used. As previously mentioned, this study is not be able to determine if cyberstalking was the only method used or if it came before other

forms of stalking due to the survey design. However, the current research provides an examination of intimate partner stalking and the use of technology using national data.

Theoretical Framework

There has been scant research on theory of stalking (Melton, 2007a). And this is certainly a reflection of the fact that the stalking field is only beginning to develop, and most of the research focus has been mainly descriptive, such as defining stalking and looking at prevalence (Melton, 2007a). The research to date that has focused on theory has been mostly psychological (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2000). However, the gendered nature of stalking in general and more specifically intimate partner stalking suggests that feminist theory may be relevant to this problem.

Feminist Perspective

Feminist theories focus on the concept of patriarchy to explain violence against women. Society is structured around gender where men are the dominant class (Bogard, 1988; MacKinnon, 1993). It is this social structure that is the root cause of intimate partner violence. Feminists also see the family as a social institution that reinforces gender hierarchies and violence against women (Bogard, 1988). As such feminists concentrate analyses of violence against women on patriarchal culture, power, and gender (Bogard, 1988). And suggest that the patriarchal society and the development of specific gender roles are factors that contribute to violence against women (Smith, 1990; Yllö, 1984). Further institutions within the patriarchal society support the gender roles of dominant males and subservient females (Brewster, 2003). Violence within intimate relationships forms out of inequality and reinforces male domination

and female subordination (Yllö, 2005). Consequently violence against women is viewed as a controlling behavior that maintains this subordination (O'Neill, 1998).

It has been suggested that violence against women may not be sufficiently understood unless gender and power are considered (Yllö, 2005). And some have pointed to the importance of stalking literature to incorporate dimensions of coercive control, specifically as it relates to intimate partner violence (Mechanic et al., 2000b). Violence against women has also been conceptualized as a type of coercive control and power (Bogard, 1988; Yllö, 2005). That is, the violence by a man against his intimate partner is motivated by the goal of maintaining power and control over her (O'Neill, 1998; Yllö, 2005).

Applied to stalking, the feminist perspective would suggest that stalking is a result of male-dominance. The feminist perspective would argue that intimate partner stalking is just another indication of the patriarchal society (Brewster, 2003). Stalking has been suggested to be another method abusers use to maintain dominance and control over their intimate partners (Melton, 2007a). Male stalkers may view stalking as an entitlement to control to their intimate partners (Brewster, 2003). Brewster (2003) argues that "controlling behavior both during the relationship and during the stalking reflects his belief that not only does she belong with him, but she belongs *to* him" (p. 216). Stalking is used as a controlling behavior over victims, which is consistent with previous feminist research on domestic violence.

Feminist Views of Technology

Feminists view technology as both a positive and negative for gender relations (Wajcman, 2009). A radical feminist viewpoint is that technology is another source of

domination and control of women (Wajcman, 2009; Wajcman, 2009). Faulkner (2001) points out that technology is gendered in multiple ways. Some of these ways include the fact that the design of technology is done by mostly men, there are gender divisions in technology labor, and images of technology are typically masculine (Faulkner, 2001; Rosser, 2005; Wajcman, 2009). Further examples of oppression that radical feminists point out are that the Internet in particular makes women more vulnerable to certain crimes (e.g. pornography, cyberstalking) (Rosser, 2005). Women have been historically excluded from technology, arguably as a consequence of patriarchy (Wajcman, 2009). And those women who want to enter these technological domains may give up features of their feminine identity (Wajcman, 2009). A developing theory, cyberfeminism, views technology as more positive, suggesting that communication technologies may actually empower women (Rosser, 2005; Wajcman, 2009). Some even go as far as suggesting that technologies may lead to an end of male domination (Rosser, 2005). These feminists feel that digital technologies may actually distort the borders between males and females (Everett, 2004; Wajcman, 2009). Overall, it has argued that it may be a balance, that is, technology is not entirely patriarchal nor decidedly liberating (Wajcman, 2009).

These feminist theories regarding technology may be applicable to the study of cyberstalking in particular. Consistent with other forms of stalking victims of cyberstalking are typically female and perpetrators are male (D'Ovidio & Doyle, 2003; Moriarty & Freiberger, 2008; Sheridan & Grant, 2007; USDOJ, 1999; USDOJ, Violence Against Women Office, 2001). This form of stalking is gendered as well. Some have discussed the gender differences in perceptions of privacy while online and how cyberstalking violates one's privacy in direct way (Adam, 2002). And the victim's privacy may be further violated if the stalking behavior turns

into voyeurism (Adam, 2002). Overall, understanding the gendered nature of cyberstalking is important in examining why it occurs. Examining cyberstalking through a feminist perspective, one would expect that offenders would be male, victims would be female, and women would react more severely to cyberstalking.

Limitations of Current Research

The stalking literature has only begun to develop over the past 19 years since stalking was defined as a crime and there is still much to know. Research is still needed regarding consequences and reactions to stalking and whether they vary by stalking behavior or victim-offender relationship. The current research examines both consequences and victims' reactions to stalking and compare across types of stalking (specifically non-cyberstalking and cyberstalking) and nonintimate versus intimate stalking. There is certainly a dearth of research regarding cyberstalking. For one, cyberstalking has only recently been recognized as technology has continued to grow and stalkers have taken advantage of it. The current research adds to the existing literature on cyberstalking by examining whether or not it differs from other forms of stalking. This research also examines the use of technology by intimate partners and compares intimate cyberstalking to nonintimate cyberstalking. The literature on intimate partner stalking is also a growing field that has shown there are differences between intimate and nonintimate stalking. The present study adds to the existing research by comparing intimate and nonintimate stalking and examining if intimate stalking is related to other forms of victimization. Lastly, because the stalking literature has only recently begun, most of the focus has been on determining what stalking is and the patterns of stalking, and leaving out discussion of theoretical reasons for stalking. It has been suggested that generalizable results may help to

develop theories on the causes of stalking (Spence-Diehl, 2003). Consequently, this study used a national sample and framed the analysis within the feminist perspective.

Based on the limitations of existing literature this research was designed in two sections (see Table 1 and 2 below) to address the following questions:

- *How does intimate and non-intimate stalking differ?*
    - *Are there demographic differences between intimate and non-intimate stalking?*
    - *Did the stalking vary by types of behaviors used, severity, length and frequency?*
    - *How do the victims feel or think about their victimization? Specifically, why did the victims think they were targeted?*
    - *How did the victims feel in response to their victimization?*
    - *Did the victims define the behaviors experienced as stalking?*
    - *What actions did victims take in response to their victimization?*
    - *What were the consequences of stalking for these victims?*
- *How do cyberstalking and other forms of stalking differ (i.e. stalking with technology and offline or traditional stalking)? And does the victim-offender relationship matter (i.e. intimate partner vs. nonintimate)?*
    - *Are there demographic differences between cyberstalking and offline stalking?*
    - *Did the stalking vary by severity, length and frequency?*
    - *How do the victims feel or think about their victimization? Specifically, why did the victims think they were targeted?*
    - *How did the victims feel in response to their victimization?*
    - *Did the victims define the behaviors experienced as stalking?*

- *What actions did victims take in response to their victimization?*
- *What were the consequences of stalking for these victims?*

Table 1: Examining Stalking by Victim-Offender relationship

Intimate partner	Nonintimate partner
Demographic differences	
Types of behaviors used	
Severity of stalking	
Length and frequency of stalking	
Why victims think they were targeted	
How do victims feel in response to victimization	
What actions did victims take	
What were consequences of stalking for victims	

Table 2: Examining Cyberstalking

Cyberstalking	Stalking with Technology	Traditional Stalking
Intimate partner		Nonintimate partner
Demographic differences		
Types of behaviors used		
Severity of stalking		
Length and frequency of stalking		
Why victims think they were targeted		
How do victims feel in response to victimization		
What actions did victims take		
What were consequences of stalking for victims		

The next chapters discuss the methodology, findings, and conclusions of this study. In Chapter 3, the methodology of this research is discussed, including the data, measures, and analytic strategy. Chapter 4 discusses general differences among victim characteristics, the

nature of stalking, victims' responses, reactions, and consequences of victimization by examining these characteristics among stalking and harassment victims, by victim-offender relationship, by stalking type, and stalking type by victim-offender relationship. Chapter 5 provides an a look at differences between intimate and nonintimate stalking, specifically examining differences in the nature of stalking, severity of stalking, victim responses, victim reactions, and consequences of victimization. Chapter 6 discusses the differences in the nature of stalking, severity of stalking, victim responses, victim reactions, and consequences of victimization by stalking type and victim-offender relationship. Chapter 7 presents the multivariate analyses used to examine whether stalking victimization varied by severity or length and frequency when looking at the victim-offender relationship and stalking type; as well as whether the victim self-defined the unwanted behaviors they experienced as stalking. Chapter 8 discusses a final overview of the findings. And finally, Chapter 9 provides the discussion and conclusions of this research study.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Data

The dataset that will be used in the current study is the National Crime Victimization Survey: Stalking Victimization Supplement (United States Department of Justice (USDOJ), Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), 2009). The Supplemental Victimization Survey (SVS[1]) was a one-time supplement to the annual National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) completed in 2006. The SVS was intended to measure the prevalence, characteristics, and consequences of nonfatal stalking on a national level.

Sampling procedures for the SVS were the same as the NCVS as the SVS was administered after the NCVS interview. Respondents were selected by the U.S. Census Bureau using a "rotating panel" design. Households in the U.S. are randomly selected and all age-eligible individuals (12 years or older) become part of the panel. Data were collected using two modes – paper-and-pencil interviewing (both in person and by telephone with the responses entered on a paper instrument) and computer-assisted telephone interviewing. NCVS interviews were conducted with each household member age 12 or older. Following a completed NCVS interview, only household members age 18 or older were given an SVS interview. There were

[1] One will note the different use of the survey description as either the Stalking Victimization Supplement or the Supplemental Victimization Survey. The dataset is referred to as the National Crime Victimization Survey: Stalking Victimization Supplement (USDOJ, BJS, 2009). And within the BJS report the survey is described as the Supplemental Victimization Survey (SVS) (Baum et al., 2009). The reason behind this is that when the survey was conducted, the researchers did not want the word stalking in the survey at all, and as such they called it simply a supplemental victimization survey.

approximately 65,270 respondents with a response rate of 83% (Baum, Catalano, Rand, & Rose, 2009).

Those persons who were eligible for the SVS interview were asked a short set of questions to screen respondents for stalking victimization. The following behaviorally-specific questions were used:

> *Not including bill collectors, telephone solicitors, or other sales people, has anyone, male or female, EVER – frightened, concerned, angered, or annoyed you by…making unwanted phone calls to you or leaving messages? Sending unsolicited or unwanted letters, e-mails, or other forms of written correspondence or communication? Following you or spying on you? Waiting outside or inside places for you such as your home, school, workplace, or recreation place? Showing up at places where you were even though he or she had no business being there? Leaving unwanted items, presents, or flowers? Posting information or spreading rumors about you on the Internet, in a public place, or by word of mouth?* (Baum et al., 2009; USDOJ, BJS, 2009).

If the respondent answered "none" to the any of the series in the above question, the interviewer did not continue and SVS was complete. Persons who experienced at least one of the above-mentioned behaviors were asked if the behavior(s) occurred on more than one occasion, on the same day or different days, and when the behavior(s) occurred (i.e. within the last 12 months prior to the interview date). Persons who experienced at least one of the behaviors on more than one occasion and on separate days within the past 12 months prior to the interview were screened into and administered the entire SVS. Respondents did not have to self-identify as stalking victims to meet the screening criteria. In fact, the term stalking was not used until the final

question of the SVS. The survey defines stalking as "a course of conduct directed at a specific person that would cause a reasonable person to feel fear" (Baum et al., 2009). Respondents were considered to be stalking victims if they had experienced at least one of the above-mentioned behaviors on at least two separate occasions on separate days with one of the contacts occurring during the 12 months prior to the interview (Baum et al., 2009). Additionally, the respondent must have feared for their safety or that of a family member due to the course of conduct, or experienced additional threatening behaviors (i.e. crimes) that make a reasonable person fearful (Baum et al., 2009). The following questions were used to identify actions that would make a reasonable person to feel fear:

> *In order to frighten or intimidate you, did this person attack or attempt to attack…a child? Another family member? A friend or co-worker? A pet?* (Baum et al., 2009).

> *During the last twelve months, did this person attack or attempt to attack you by…hitting, slapping, or knocking you down? Choking or strangling you? Raping or sexually assaulting you? Attacking you with a weapon? Chasing or dragging you with a car? Attacking you in some other way?* (Baum et al., 2009).

> *Other than the attacks or attempted attack you just told me about, during the last 12 months, did this person threaten to…kill you? Rape or sexually assault you? Harm you with a weapon? Hit, slap, or harm you in some other way? Harm or kidnap a child? Harm another family member? Harm a friend or co-worker? Harm a pet? Harm or kill (himself/herself)?* (Baum et al., 2009).

> *What were you most afraid of happening as these unwanted contacts or behaviors were occurring? Death; physical/bodily harm; harm or kidnap respondent's child; harm current partner/boyfriend/girlfriend; harm other family members; don't know what would happen* (Baum et al., 2009).

The following questions were used to measure fear:

> *How did the behavior (of this person/these persons) make you feel when it FIRST started? Anything else? Anxious/concerned; annoyed angry; frightened; depressed; helpless; sick; suicidal; some other way – specify* (Baum et al., 2009).

> *How did you feel as the behaviors progressed? Anything else? No change in feelings; anxious/concerned; annoyed angry; frightened; depressed; helpless; sick; suicidal; some other way – specify* (Baum et al., 2009).

Victims who experienced the behaviors related with stalking, but neither reported feeling fear nor experienced other actions that would cause a reasonable person to feel fear were defined as harassment victims (Baum et al., 2009).

Why the SVS?

There have been few national studies that measure the extent and nature of stalking in the United States. The most notable, perhaps, is the National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS) conducted in 1995-1996, which as heavily cited and important as it is, is now 14 years old. Additionally, the NVAW survey was not solely concentrated on examining the nature

and extent of stalking, but rather it was designed to better understand violence against women in general. The SVS was designed with the purpose of augmenting the empirical knowledge about stalking at a national level. And it is now the largest study of stalking completed to date (Baum et al., 2009). Like the NVAW survey, the SVS uses behaviorally-specific questions so that the victims do not need to self-identify as stalking victims. That is, using these types of questions does not assume the victims knew how to define stalking or perceive what they may have experienced as stalking. Additionally, the SVS allows for the examination of cyberstalking on a national level, which has not been previously possible. Furthermore, because the SVS was a supplement to the NCVS, the responses can be linked to allow for a fuller understanding of the stalking victim's situation. Overall, the SVS is important to examine to provide further empirical knowledge of stalking on a national level.

Measures

The SVS survey contained questions related to various dimensions of stalking behavior, including offender-victim relationship, onset, duration, and desistance, other crimes committed against the victim in conjunction with stalking, victim response, criminal justice response, and cost to victim. In addition, these responses are linked with responses from the NCVS instrument. All recodes that are specific to analysis are discussed in the appropriate chapter.

Victim Characteristics

Victim characteristics include gender, age, race, ethnicity (Hispanic origin), education, marital status, and income. Gender was measured as male (0) or female (1). Age was considered age at last birthday. Race was either white, black/African American, American

Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, or other (respondents were allowed to choose multiple responses). In addition, respondents were categorized as of either of Hispanic origin or not of Hispanic origin. These variables were further combined and reduced to make four categories – white, non-Hispanic, black, non-Hispanic, other, non-Hispanic, and Hispanic. Education was educational attainment measured from less than high school to graduate or professional degree. Marital status was married, widowed, divorced, separated, or never married. And income was considered household income in categories ranging from less than $5,000 to $75,000 and over.

Stalking Behaviors

The following stalking behaviors were measured using behaviorally-specific questions (each question was a separate variable):

> *Not including bill collectors, telephone solicitors, or other sales people, has anyone, male or female, EVER – frightened, concerned, angered, or annoyed you by…making unwanted phone calls to you or leaving messages? Sending unsolicited or unwanted letters, e-mails, or other forms of written correspondence or communication? Following you or spying on you? Waiting outside or inside places for you such as your home, school, workplace, or recreation place? Showing up at places where you were even though he or she had no business being there? Leaving unwanted items, presents, or flowers? Posting information or spreading rumors about you on the Internet, in a public place, or by word of mouth?* (USDOJ, BJS, 2009).

Additionally, cyberstalking was also measured using two series of questions. Again, each behavior was a separate variable.

During the last 12 months, did (this person/these people) use any of the following methods of Internet communication to harass or threaten you…e-mail; instant messenger; chat rooms; blogs, message or bulletin boards; other Internet sites about you? (USDOJ, BJS, 2009).

During the last 12 months, did (this person/these people) use any of the following electronic devices to track or monitor your behavior…video or digital cameras; computer programs which retrace or monitor your use, such as Spyware; electronic listening devices or bugs; Global Positioning Systems (also known as GPS)? (USDOJ, BJS, 2009).

Severity, Length, and Frequency of Stalking

Other crimes and injuries that were committed in conjunction with the stalking behaviors were measured as well using the following questions (all separate variables).

During the series of unwanted contacts or behavior did this person do any of the following in the last 12 months: illegally enter or attempt to enter your house/apartment; illegally enter or attempt to enter your car; damage or attempt to damage or destroy your property belong to you or someone else in the household? (USDOJ, BJS, 2009).

In order to frighten or intimidate you, did this person attack or attempt to attack…a child; another family member; a friend or co-worker; a pet? (USDOJ, BJS, 2009).

> *During the last 12 months, did this person attack or attempt to attack you by…hitting, slapping, or knocking you down; chocking or strangling you; raping or sexually assaulting you; attacking you with a weapon; chasing or dragging with a car; attacking you in some other way?* (USDOJ, BJS, 2009).

If attacked with a weapon, the respondent was asked what the weapon was (response categories included hand gun, other gun, knife, other sharp object, blunt object, and other). If respondents experienced an attack or attempted attack that included hitting, slapping, or knocking them down, choking or strangling, raping or sexually assaulting, or attack with a weapon, they were then asked if they sustained any physical injuries (response categories included none; raped; attempted rape; sexual assault other than rape or attempted rape; knife or stab wounds; gun shot, bullet wounds; broken bones or teeth knocked out; internal injuries; knocked unconscious; bruised, black eye, scratches, swelling, chipped teeth; other). Moreover, respondents were also asked if the perpetrator threatened them with the following question (where each threat was a separate variable):

> *(Other than the attacks or attempted attacks you just told me about), during the last 12 months, did this person threaten to…kill you; rape or sexually assault you; harm you with a weapon; hit, slap, or harm you in some other way; harm or kidnap a child; harm another family member; harm a friend or co-worker; harm a pet; harm or kill (himself/herself); threaten in some other way?* (USDOJ, BJS, 2009).

The onset of the stalking was determined by asking how long ago the victim realized these behaviors were happening (*How long ago did you realize these things were happening to*

you?) (USDOJ, BJS, 2009). The frequency of the stalking behaviors was determined by asking the following question:

> *In the last 12 months, about how often would you say the unwanted contacts or behavior occurred? Would you say – once or twice a year; once or twice a month; once or twice a week; almost every day; at least once a day; no set pattern or sporadically?*(USDOJ, BJS, 2009).

Respondents who experienced the contacts or behaviors at least once a day were then asked how many times a day the unwanted contacts or behaviors occurred. Respondents who stated there was not set pattern or it was sporadic were asked how many times the unwanted contacts or behavior occurred in the last 12 months.

Victim Response and Reaction

Victims were asked why they thought the perpetrator started their behaviors. And each of the responses was coded as separate variables.

> *Why do you think (this person/these people) started doing these things to you? Any other reasons? Response categories: for retaliation, to scare, me, perpetrator was angry, out of spite; to catch me doing something; to control me, perpetrator was jealous, possessive, or insecure; to keep me in the relationship, to keep me from leaving, because I left the perpetrator; perpetrator thought I liked the attention; perpetrator was an alcoholic or drug abuser; perpetrator was mentally ill or emotionally unstable; perpetrator liked the attention; perpetrator like me, found me attractive, had a crush on me; perpetrator had different cultural beliefs or background; proximity, convenience, because I was alone; other – specify; don't know* (USDOJ, BJS, 2009).

Victims were also asked how they felt when the behaviors first started and as the behaviors progressed. Each response category was a separate variable.

> *How did the behavior (of this person/these persons) make you feel when it FIRST started? Anything else? Response categories: anxious/concerned; annoyed angry; frightened; depressed; helpless; sick; suicidal; some other way – specify*
>
> *How did you feel as the behaviors progressed? Anything else? Response categories: no change in feelings; anxious/concerned; annoyed angry; frightened; depressed; helpless; sick; suicidal; some other way – specify* (USDOJ, BJS, 2009).

And victims were asked what they were most afraid of happening as the behaviors were occurring. Again, each response category was a separate variable.

> *What were you most afraid of happening as these unwanted contacts or behaviors were occurring? Response categories: death; physical/bodily harm; harm or kidnap respondent's child; harm current partner/boyfriend/girlfriend; harm other family members; don't know what would happen* (USDOJ, BJS, 2009).

The responses of the victims were measured with questions relating to things that victims might do to protect themselves or stop the behaviors. Each separate response category was a separate variable.

> *Now I am going to read you a list of things that people might do to protect themselves or stop the behaviors from continuing. In the last 12 months, have you done any of the following – (change day-to-day activities categories) take time off from work or school; change or quit a job or school; change the way you went to work or school; avoid*

relatives, friends, or holiday celebrations; change your usual activities outside of work or school; stay with friends or relatives or had them stay with you; alter your appearance to be unrecognizable; take self-defense or martial arts classes; get pepper spray; get a gun; get any other kind of weapon; (change personal information categories) change your social security number; change e-mail address; change telephone number; install caller ID or call blocking systems; change or install new locks or a security system? (USDOJ, BJS, 2009).

Victims were also asked about whether or not they asked others for help in order to protect themselves or stop the behaviors. Each separate category a separate variable.

Some people might ask others for help in order to protect themselves or stop the behaviors from continuing. In the last 12 months, did you – enlist the help of friends or family; ask people not to release information about you; hire a private investigator; talk to an attorney; contact victim services, a shelter, or help line; obtain a restraining, protection, or stay-away order; talk to a mental health professional; talk to a doctor or nurse; talk to your clergy or faith leader; talk to your boss or employer; contact your building or office security person? (USDOJ, BJS, 2009).

Also, the victims were asked if they moved in order to protect themselves or stop the behavior. If yes, they were then asked where they moved (response categories included a different house/apartment but in the same area, a different city or state; a shelter or safe house; some other place). Further, the victims were also asked whether, after any action taken, the behaviors were still occurring. Additionally, it was also inquired whether or not the victim or someone else

reported the behaviors to law enforcement (yes or no). If yes, the respondent was asked how many times they or someone else contacted the police to report the behaviors.

Finally, victims were asked whether or not they considered the unwanted contacts or behaviors to be stalking (*Do you consider the series of unwanted contacts or harassing behavior you told me about to be stalking?*) (USDOJ, BJS, 2009).

Data Validity Check

Before analysis began, it was important to consider whether the data were valid by performing validity checks to match these data with the BJS report (Baum et al., 2009). In order to complete this process, an attempt was made to determine how to extract stalking victims and harassment victims from the sample. With multiple failed attempts to match these data to the report, personal communication was made with the lead statistician for these data, Dr. Katrina Baum. And ultimately, the syntax file from Dr. Baum and BJS was sent to the researcher in order to obtain the proper number of total victims, stalking victims, and harassment victims. Once this was implemented, the researcher completed various analyses and was able to match multiple tables within the report.

Analytic Strategy

The analysis proceeded in multiple steps. First, general frequencies of the characteristics of stalking victims are provided. These characteristics were examined by stalking type. Comparisons were made between intimate and non-intimate stalking using the appropriate statistical analyses to determine the differences in demographic characteristics, types of behaviors, severity, length, and frequency of behaviors. Further, comparisons were made

between cyberstalking and other forms of stalking behaviors using the appropriate statistical analyses to determine the differences in demographic characteristics, severity, length, and frequency of behaviors. Victims' reactions and responses were examined by stalking type and victim-offender relationship using the appropriate statistical analyses. Finally, multivariate regression models were used to predict seriousness and severity of stalking and whether or not the victim defined the behaviors as stalking by victim-offender relationship and stalking type.

CHAPTER FOUR: VICTIM CHARACTERISTICS AND STALKING PATTERNS

The first step in analysis was to conduct frequency distributions of relevant study variables, presented in Tables 3 through 9. Demographic characteristics, stalking and harassment behaviors experienced by victims, and the victim-offender relationship were shown for the overall sample of victims (N=1683), stalking victims (N=983), and harassment victims (N=700).

Victim Characteristics

Gender

The sample consisted of 1,683 victims who screened into the SVS, 67.6% were females and 32.4% were males (Table 3). Among stalking victims, 75.5% were females. And among harassment victims, 56.4% were females. It appears that the gender distribution was a bit more even among those who have been the victim of harassment alone. As for the gender of the offender, the majority of all offenders were male (64.2%) with a higher percentage of male stalking offenders (67.6%) compared to harassment offenders (56.8%).

Age

The age range of all victims (stalking and harassment victims) was 18 to 90 with a mean of 40.54. The age range of both stalking and harassment victims was 18 to 90 with mean ages of 38.67 (stalking victims) and 43.17 (harassment victims).

Race and Ethnicity

Race was coded as white, black, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, or multiple races (any combination and up to 4-5 races – this was recoded into one category of multiracial). The majority of all, stalking, and harassment victims were white. Hispanic origin was also coded as yes (1) or no (2). About 8.0% of all, stalking, and harassment victims were of Hispanic origin.

Relationship Status

Relationship status was coded as never married, married, divorced, separated, or widowed. The modal relationship status category for all victims was married. The modal relationship status category for stalking victims was never married although only by a small difference with the married category very close behind. And the modal relationship status category for harassment victims was married.

Educational Attainment

Educational attainment was recoded to include less than high school, high school, some college, associate's degree, bachelor's degree, and graduate or professional degree. The median education category for all victims, stalking victims, and harassment victims was some college.

Income

Income was measured as total household income. This variable was coded into the following categories: Less than $10,000, $10,000-19,999, $20,000-29,999, $30,000-39,999, $40,000-49,999, $50,000-74,999, $75,000 or more. The median household income for all

victims was $30,000-39,999. The median household income for stalking victims was $30,000-39,999. And the median household income for harassment victims was $40,000-49,999.

Table 3: Demographic Characteristics of Stalking and Harassment Victims

Variable	All (N=1683)	Stalking (N=983)	Harassment (N=700)
Gender			
Female	67.6%	75.5%	56.4%
Mean Age (SD)	40.5 (15.2)	38.7 (14.3)	43.2 (16.1)
Race			
White	84.1	84.5	83.4
Black	10.2	9.5	11.1
American Indian/Alaska Native	1.0	0.9[a]	1.0[a]
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.5	2.4	2.6
Multiracial	2.4	2.6	1.9
Hispanic Origin			
Hispanic	8.2	8.6	7.5
Relationship status			
Never married	32.1	34.3	29.0
Married	38.5	33.9	45.0
Divorced or separated	24.8	28.2	20.1
Widowed	4.5	3.6	5.9
Education			
Less than high school	10.2	11.5	8.4
High school	27.7	28.6	26.5
Some college	26.5	27.2	25.6
Associate degree	9.1	8.6	9.7
Bachelor degree	17.2	15.6	19.4
Graduate or professional degree	9.4	8.5	10.7
Household income			
Less than $10,000	11.3	12.9	8.8
$10,000-19,999	15.3	17.0	12.7
$20,000-29,999	12.7	12.8	12.6
$30,000-39,999	12.2	12.2	12.1
$40,000-49,999	9.9	10.6	8.8
$50,000-74,999	17.3	15.9	19.4
$75,000 or more	21.4	18.5	25.6

Note: Sample size varies due to missing cases. [a] Based on less than 10 cases.

Stalking and Harassment Behaviors

Table 4 shows specific stalking and harassment behaviors experienced by victims. The majority of victims were likely to have experienced unwanted phone calls and messages (67.6%). The next most frequent behavior experienced was unwanted letters, e-mails, or other written communication (34.5%). Like all victims, the majority of both stalking and harassment victims were likely to experience unwanted phone calls and messages (68.8% and 65.9% respectively). Stalking victims were three times as likely to have experienced the more physical stalking behaviors of following or spying, waiting for victims, and showing up at places. By examining the frequencies, it appears that stalking victims were more likely to experience the full range of behaviors compared to harassment victims.

Table 4: Stalking and Harassment Behaviors Experienced by Victims

	All (N=1683)	Stalking (N=983)	Harassment (N=700)
Unwanted phone calls and messages	67.6%	68.8%	65.9%
Unwanted letters, e-mails, or other written communication	34.5	33.6	35.9
Following or spying	27.3	36.8	13.9
Waiting for victim at various places	22.9	31.2	11.3
Showing up at places	24.9	33.9	12.3
Leaving unwanted items, presents, or flowers	11.2	14.3	6.9
Posting information or spreading rumors	32.7	39.5	23.3

Note: Multiple responses were allowed. Sample size varies due to missing cases.

Table 5 shows cyberstalking and stalking with technology (or electronic monitoring of victims). About 18.0% of all victims experienced some form of cyberstalking. The most frequently experienced method used to harass or threaten all victims was e-mail (18.4%)

followed by instant messenger (5.8%). More victims experienced cyberstalking behaviors than electronic monitoring or stalking with technology (i.e. computer spyware). And only a very small portion of victims experienced both types of stalking. The most frequently experienced method used to harass or threaten both stalking and harassment victims was e-mail (16.7% and 21.1% respectively). It appears that both stalking and harassment victims experienced a similar range of cyberstalking behaviors. However, if one looks at stalking with technology, it appears that a greater proportion of stalking victims experienced electronic monitoring compared to harassment victims.

Table 5: Cyberstalking and Electronic Monitoring Experienced by Victims

	All (N=1683)	Stalking (N=983)	Harassment (N=700)
Cyberstalking	17.9%	16.6%	19.7%
E-mail	18.4	16.7	21.1
Instant messenger	5.8	6.7	4.4
Chat rooms	0.9	0.9[a]	0.8[a]
Blogs, message/bulletin boards	2.6	2.4	2.8
Internet sites about victim	1.9	1.9	1.8
Stalking with technology	3.0	4.5	0.9
Video or digital cameras	2.5	3.7	0.7[a]
Computer spyware	2.9	2.8	2.4
Listening devices/bugs	2.4	3.6	0.5[a]
GPS	0.5	0.8[a]	0.2[a]
Both cyberstalking and stalking with technology	2.6	3.0[b]	2.1
No cyberstalking or stalking with technology	76.5	76.0	77.3

Note: Multiple responses were allowed. Sample size varies due to missing cases.
[a] Based on less than 10 cases. [b] Because the number of respondents in this category are so small, they will be excluded from all further analysis (N=29).

Nature of Stalking and Harassment Behaviors

Table 6 shows frequency distributions of the relevant variables regarding the nature of stalking and harassment behaviors. Other crimes that were perpetrated against the victims by their stalkers, attacks on the victims or their family or friends, threats made against the victims, the duration and frequency of stalking and/or harassment, and whether behaviors were still occurring were examined. It is important to note that by definition harassment victims were not

attacked or threatened nor were their friends, family, or pets; and therefore, these items are missing in the table for harassment victims (Baum et al., 2009).

Among all victims, a small percentage (4.0-9.8%) experienced property crimes in conjunction with their stalking or harassment victimization. However, differences emerge when stalking victims were considered separately from harassment victims. It appears that stalking victims had more property crimes committed against them than harassment victims. Close to 15.0% of stalking victims experienced their property being damaged or destroyed.

Of the attacks on persons/pets other than the stalking victims, the most common attack was on another family member (6.1%). Among stalking victims, the most common type of attack experienced in conjunction with stalking was to be hit, slapped, or knocked down by their stalker (11.4%). Of those stalking victims who were attacked by a weapon, the most common weapon used was a knife or other sharp object (40.0%). And of those stalking victims who were physically injured when they were attacked by their stalker, the most common physical injuries they sustained were bruises, black eye, cuts, scratches, swelling, or chipped teeth (49.6%). Stalking offenders were most likely to have threatened to hit, slap, or harm the victim (13.9%) or kill the victim (12.4%).

About half of all stalking and harassment victims have experienced the unwanted behaviors for less than one year. More stalking victims (47.0%) than harassment victims (40.8%) have experienced the unwanted behaviors for more than one year. Just over 20.0% of both stalking and harassment victims responded that there was no set pattern to the unwanted behaviors. And more stalking victims (45.3%) than harassment victims (39.1%) experienced the

unwanted behaviors at least once per week. And almost 40.0% of both stalking and harassment victims reported that the unwanted behaviors were still occurring.

Table 6: Nature of Stalking and Harassment Behaviors

Variable	All (N=1683)	Stalking (N=983)	Harassment (N=700)
Other crimes perpetrated against victim[a]			
Property Crimes			
Illegally entered house/apartment	9.0%	13.3%	2.3%
Illegally entered car	4.0	6.3	0.5[b]
Damaged or destroyed property	9.8	14.9	1.9
Identity Theft			
Charged items to credit card	1.9	2.0	1.6
Opened/closed accounts	2.6	3.4	1.3
Took money from accounts	2.4	3.3	1.0
Attacked or attempted to attack[a,c]			
A child	2.3	3.8	----
Another family member	3.8	6.1	----
A friend or co-worker	3.3	5.3	----
A pet	2.3	3.8	----
Attacked or attempted to attack victim[a,c]			
Hit, slapped, or knocked down	6.9	11.4	----
Choked or strangled	2.2	3.6	----
Raped or sexually assaulted	0.9	1.4	----
Attacked with a weapon	2.3	3.7	----
Chased or dragged with a car	2.0	3.2	----
Attacked in some other way	4.7	7.7	----
Weapon used in attack[a,c,d]			
Gun	25.7[b]	25.7[b]	----
Knife or other sharp object	40.0	40.0	----
Blunt or other object	34.3	34.3	----
Physical injuries sustained in attack[a,c,e]			
None	42.7	42.7	----
Raped	3.8[b]	3.8[b]	----
Attempted rape	1.5[b]	1.5[b]	----
Sexual assault	2.3[b]	2.3[b]	----
Knife or stab wounds	2.3[b]	2.3[b]	----
Gunshot, bullet wounds	----	----	----
Broken bones or teeth knocked out	3.8[b]	3.8[b]	----

Variable	All (N=1683)	Stalking (N=983)	Harassment (N=700)
Internal injuries	1.5[b]	1.5[b]	----
Knocked unconscious	3.1[b]	3.1[b]	----
Bruises, black eye, cuts, scratches, swelling, chipped teeth	49.6	49.6	----
Other	7.6	7.6	----
Threats made against victims[a,c]			
Kill victim	7.5	12.4	----
Rape or sexually assault victim	1.1	1.9	----
Harm victim with a weapon	4.3	7.2	----
Hit, slap, or harm victim in some other way	8.4	13.9	----
Harm or kidnap a child	3.1	5.2	----
Harm another family member	4.0	6.7	----
Harm a friend or co-worker	2.6	4.4	----
Harm a pet	1.7	2.8	----
Harm or kill (himself/herself)	5.4	9.0	----
Threaten victim in some other way	8.8	15.1	----
Onset/duration of stalking or harassment			
Less than one year	55.4	53.0	59.3
One to five years	36.2	37.7	33.7
More than five years	8.4	9.3	7.1
Frequency of stalking or harassment			
Once or twice a year	13.6	11.6	16.8
Once or twice a month	16.8	17.2	16.3
Once or twice a week	19.9	22.3	16.1
Almost every day	14.6	16.5	11.7
At least once a day	8.4	6.5	11.3
No set pattern	26.6	25.9	27.8
Stalking or harassment behaviors still occurring	37.0	36.3	38.1

Sample size varies due to missing cases.
[a] Multiple responses were allowed. [b] Based on less than 10 cases. [c] Not applicable to harassment victims. By definition harassment victims were not attacked or threatened nor were their friends, family, or pets. [d] Only asked of those victims who were attacked with a weapon (N=36). [e] Only asked of those victims who were attacked physically, not with a car or in "some other way" (N=131).

Victims' Responses to Stalking and Harassment Victimization

Table 7 shows the frequency distributions of all, stalking, and harassment victims' responses to their victimization. The variables that were examined include the victims' perception of reasons the unwanted behaviors began, how the victims felt when the behaviors began and when the behaviors progressed, the victims' worst fears resulting from victimization, and whether or not the victims defined the behaviors as stalking. By definition, harassment victims did not report feeling suicidal as a result of the unwanted behaviors nor were they frightened as the behaviors progressed; and they were not fearful for their own or family member's safety (Baum et al., 2009).

Nearly one third of stalking and harassment victims felt that the perpetrator began stalking them for retaliation, anger, or spite (29.8%). More stalking victims felt that the perpetrator began stalking for control (32.5%) or because he/she was mentally ill or emotionally unstable (24.0%) than harassment victims (12.8% and 6.2%, respectively). And about twice as many harassment victims (26.4%) than stalking victims (10.9%) reported that they did not know why the perpetrator began stalking them.

The most common emotion that victims felt when the unwanted behaviors began was being annoyed or angry (72.2%). Stalking victims were more likely than harassment victims to feel anxious or concerned, frightened, depressed, helpless, and sick at the beginning of the unwanted contacts. The most common emotion that victims felt when the unwanted behaviors progressed was again annoyed or angry (48.0%). About a third of all victims reported no change in feelings. Stalking victims were more likely than harassment victims to feel anxious or

concerned, depressed, helpless, or sick as the unwanted contacts progressed. Among stalking victims, the most reported fear was not knowing what might happen next (46.8%). Over 60.0% of stalking victims feared bodily harm to themselves, their child, their current partner, or another family member. And most harassment victims reported their worst fear was the behavior would never stop (19.6%) or some other fear (49.3%). Of stalking victims, 52.3% reported that they defined the unwanted behaviors they experienced as stalking. And 20.1% of harassment victims considered the unwanted behaviors they experienced stalking.

Table 7: Victims' Responses to Stalking and Harassment Victimization

Variable	All (N=1683)	Stalking (N=983)	Harassment (N=700)
Why perpetrator started stalking[a]			
For retaliation/anger/spite	29.8%	36.4%	19.7%
Catch victim doing something	3.5	4.5	1.9
Control victim	24.7	32.5	12.8
Keep victim in relationship	12.3	15.7	7.2
Thought I liked the attention	2.5	2.5	2.5
Substance abuser	10.5	14.7	4.2
Mentally ill/emotionally unstable	17.0	24.0	6.2
Perpetrator liked attention	7.7	9.0	5.8
Liked victim/found victim attractive/had crush on victim	12.9	15.7	8.7
Different cultural beliefs/background	3.2	4.1	1.9
Proximity/convenience/victim was alone	5.1	6.8	2.5
Other	24.5	19.7	32.0
Don't know	17.0	10.9	26.4
How victim felt when stalking began[a]			
Anxious/concerned	42.7	53.1	26.2
Annoyed/angry	72.2	68.3	78.3
Frightened	27.5	42.8	3.4
Depressed	10.9	16.1	2.6
Helpless	15.9	22.8	4.8
Sick	10.4	15.6	2.1
Suicidal	0.9	1.5	----[c]
Some other way	9.6	7.7	12.4
How victim felt when stalking progressed[a]			
No change in feelings	32.2	32.5	31.8
Anxious/concerned	19.0	24.4	10.3
Annoyed/angry	48.0	43.1	55.8
Frightened	15.3	24.9	----[c]
Depressed	5.5	8.3	1.1[b]
Helpless	9.7	13.3	3.9
Sick	5.0	7.7	0.7[b]
Suicidal	0.4[b]	0.7[b]	----[c]
Some other way	7.4[b]	6.8	8.2

Variable	All (N=1683)	Stalking (N=983)	Harassment (N=700)
Victims' worst fears[a]			
Death	5.3	8.6	----[d]
Physical/bodily harm	18.6	30.2	----[d]
Harm or kidnap child	8.3	13.5	----[d]
Harm current partner	3.6	5.9	----[d]
Harm other family members	7.7	12.5	----[d]
Loss of job	5.1	6.3	3.3
Loss of freedom	6.5	9.8	1.3[b]
Behavior would never stop	25.5	29.3	19.6
Not knowing what might happen next	28.8	46.8	----[d]
Lose mind	3.0	4.4	0.8[b]
Other	29.2	16.7	49.3
Don't know	14.5	5.2	29.4
Victim defined behaviors as stalking	39.4	52.3	20.4

Sample size varies due to missing cases.
[a] Multiple responses were allowed. [b] Based on less than 10 cases. [c] Harassment victims, by definition, did not report feeling suicidal as the result of the unwanted behaviors nor were they frightened as the unwanted behaviors progressed. [d] Harassment victims, by definition, were not fearful for their own or family member's safety (i.e. did not fear death, bodily harm, that the perpetrator would harm others, or not knowing what might happen next).

Victims' Reactions and Consequences of Stalking and Harassment Victimization

Table 8 shows the frequency distributions for all, stalking, and harassment victims' reactions to and consequences of their victimization. The most common action that all victims took in order to protect themselves was changing their usual activities (14.3%). Overall, stalking victims took a greater number of protective actions than harassment victims. In fact, 77.4% of all harassment victims did not change any of their behaviors in order to protect themselves. The most common protective action taken among stalking victims was changing usual activities (21.6%); and installing caller ID or call blocking among harassment victims (6.9%).

Among all victims, the most common type of help sought was to enlist the help of family or friends (29.5%). Stalking victims were more likely than harassment victims to have sought some form of help. About 71.0% of harassment victims did not seek help. Stalking victims (40.7%) were about four times as likely as harassment victims (10.1%) to have reported the behaviors to the police.

Stalking victims were more likely to have moved (13.8%) due to the unwanted contacts than harassment victims (2.2%). And of those victims who did move, the majority moved to a different dwelling or city or state. Additionally, more stalking victims (3.8%) lost their job because of the unwanted behaviors the harassment victims (0.3%). And stalking victims had also lost more time from work due to various reasons than harassment victims.

Table 8: Victims' Reactions to and Consequences of Stalking and Harassment Victimization

Variable	All (N=1683)	Stalking (N=983)	Harassment (N=700)
Actions taken to protect victim[a]			
Took time off from work or school	10.7%	16.6%	2.4%
Changed or quit job or school	6.5	9.3	2.6
Changed route to work or school	8.9	13.1	3.0
Avoided family/friends	10.3	15.1	3.7
Changed usual activities	14.3	21.6	4.0
Stayed with family/friends	11.3	17.8	2.1
Altered appearance	1.6	2.4	0.4[b]
Took self-defense classes	0.9	1.2	0.4[b]
Got pepper spray	4.1	6.4	0.9[b]
Got a gun	2.0	3.1	0.6[b]
Got another kind of weapon	1.7	2.0	1.1[b]
Changed social security number	0.2[b]	0.2[b]	0.3[b]
Changed e-mail address	5.9	7.2	4.1
Changed telephone number	12.1	16.6	5.7
Installed caller ID/call blocking	13.7	18.5	6.9
Changed or installed new locks or security system	9.0	13.5	2.6
Did not change behaviors	55.6	40.0	77.4
Help sought by victims[a]			
Enlisted help of friends/family	29.5	41.7	12.4
Asked people not to release information	23.8	32.7	11.3
Hired a private investigator	0.8	1.3	0.1[b]
Talked to an attorney	14.1	20.8	4.7
Contact victim services/shelter/help line	4.7	7.6	0.6[b]
Obtained a restraining/protection/stay away order	9.3	15.6	0.6[b]
Talked to a mental health professional	8.6	12.9	2.4
Talked to a doctor or nurse	6.4	9.7	1.7
Talked to clergy/faith leader	6.8	9.9	2.6
Talked to boss/employer	16.3	21.9	8.4
Contacted building/office security	6.3	9.4	2.0
Did not seek help	47.4	30.6	70.9
Reported to police	28.9	40.7	10.1

Variable	All (N=1683)	Stalking (N=983)	Harassment (N=700)
Moved	9.3	13.8	2.2
If moved, where to[a]			
A different house/apartment	52.7	54.1	38.5
A different city/state	48.0	50.4	23.1
A shelter or safe house	4.7	5.2	----
Some other place	5.4	2.2	38.5
Lost job	2.5	3.8	0.3[b]
Reason lost time from work[c]			
Fear or concern for safety	10.9	15.7	2.2[b]
Getting a restraining/protection order or testifying in court	9.8	14.4	1.4[b]
Changing phone number/moving/fixing damaged property	6.1	8.4	1.9[b]

Sample size varies due to missing cases.
[a] Multiple responses were allowed. [b] Based on less than 10 cases. [c] Asked only of those who worked during the last 12 months from the interview.

Victim-Offender Relationship

The victim-offender relationship was defined as the relationship of the offender to the victim when the behaviors first began and was measured in twenty different responses with both relative and nonrelative options. This was recoded as current spouse, ex-spouse, current boy/girlfriend, ex- boy/girlfriend, friend/roommate/neighbor, known from work or school, acquaintance, relative, stranger, and unknown (this includes both 'unable to identify the person' and 'other nonrelative'). These categories were recoded in this manner to be consistent with the Bureau of Justice Statistics report regarding these data (Baum et al., 2009).

Table 9 shows the frequency distribution of victim-offender relationship for all victims, stalking victims, and harassment victims. The majority of offenders were known to all victims

(71.5% respectively). And 26.4% were intimate partners (both former and current). Interestingly, one can see that among intimate partners, there were a higher percentage in each of the former (ex-) partner categories. And 28.4% of offenders were either strangers or unknown to all victims. The majority of offenders were known to the both stalking and harassment victims (74.2% and 65.0% respectively). Among stalking victims, 29.2% of known offenders were intimate partners. And among harassment victims, 20.8% of known offenders were intimate partners. Also, there was a higher percentage of former intimate partner offenders for both stalking and harassment victims. Among stalking victims, 25.4% of offenders were either strangers or unknown. And among harassment victims, 34.8% of offenders were either strangers or unknown. In addition, it is relevant to mention that when examining the victim-offender relationship by stalking type, the majority of offenders are also known to victims across all categories. Specifically, the majority of offenders were known either as an intimate or other to victims of cyberstalking (76.6%), victims of stalking with technology (81.6%), victims of both cyberstalking and technology stalking (90.5%), and victims of traditional stalking (73.3%).

Table 9: Victim-offender Relationship in Stalking and Harassment

	All (N=1313)	Stalking (N=879)	Harassment (N=434)
Known, intimate			
Current spouse	4.5%	5.8%	1.8%
Current boy/girlfriend	3.6	3.0	4.8
Ex-spouse	7.6	9.0	4.8
Ex-boy/girlfriend	10.7	11.4	9.4
Known, other			
Friend/roommate/neighbor	16.7	16.7	16.6
Known from work or school	10.1	9.8	10.8
Acquaintance	9.3	9.7	8.5
Relative	9.0	9.3	8.3
Stranger	11.0	10.0	13.1
Unknown	17.4	15.4	21.7

Note: This includes only those victims who could identify a single offender who was most responsible. Sample size varies due to missing cases.

Examining Stalking by Victim-Offender Relationship

The next analyses examined stalking victimization by victim-offender relationship. Specifically the victim-offender relationship was coded into four categories – known intimate (includes current spouse, ex-spouse, current boy/girlfriend, and ex-boy/girlfriend), known other (includes friend/roommate/neighbor, known from work or school, acquaintance, and relative), stranger, or unknown (includes both unable to identify the person and other nonrelative). These next analyses and all further analyses are completed for stalking victims only.

Stalking Victim Characteristics

Table 10 shows the frequency distributions of stalking victim characteristics by their relationship with their offender. There were a total of 983 stalking victims, and of those, 879 could identify a single offender who was most responsible. Bivariate analyses were conducted to

test the significance of association between the victim-offender relationship and victim characteristics.

Gender

The majority of all the stalking victims in each victim-offender relationship were females. And the majority of offenders in all victim-offender relationships were male with the highest percentage of male offenders occurring in the known intimate category (75.0%). No significant gender differences were found among the victim-offender relationship categories.

Age

The age range of stalking victims who were victimized by a current or former intimate partner was 18 to 62 with a mean of 34.82. Among those stalking victims who were victimized by someone else known to them, the age range was 18 to 90 with a mean of 38.92. Among those stalking victims who were victimized by a stranger, the age range was 18 to 77 with a mean of 38.40. And among those stalking victims who were victimized by someone unknown to them, the age range was 18 to 86 with a mean of 41.06. An analysis of variance revealed a significant difference in the mean age among victim-offender relationship ($F(3,875)=7.44$, $p<.001$). Post-hoc tests revealed that those stalked by intimate partners are significantly younger than those stalked by known others and unknown offenders.

Race and Ethnicity

The majority of all stalking victims regardless of their relationship with their offender were white. The majority of all stalking victims were also of non-Hispanic origin. There were no significant differences found among stalking type and race or Hispanic origin.

Relationship Status

The modal relationship status category for victims who were stalked by a current or former intimate partner was divorced or separated. The modal relationship status category for victims who were stalked by another known person was never married. And the modal relationship status category for victims who were stalked by a stranger or an unknown person was married. Significant bivariate associations were found between victim-offender relationship and relationship status, but the minimum cell counts were not reached and therefore the test is not considered robust enough to interpret.

Educational Attainment

The median education category for all victim-offender relationship categories was some college. The modal education for both those who were stalked by a current or former intimate partner and an unknown person was some college. The modal education for both those stalked by another known person and a stranger was high school. There were no significant differences found among educational attainment and victim-offender relationship.

Income

The median household income for victims in all four victim-offender relationship categories was $30,000-39,999. The modal household income for victims who were stalked by current or former intimate partners was $10,000-19,999. The modal household income for both victims who were stalked by another known person or an unknown person was $75,000 or more. And the modal household income for victims who were stalked by a stranger was less than

$10,000. There were no significant differences found among income and victim-offender relationship.

Table 10: Demographic Characteristics of Stalking Victims by Victim-Offender Relationship

Variable	Known Intimate (N=256)	Known Other (N=400)	Stranger (N=88)	Unknown (N=135)
Gender				
Female	76.2%	73.3%	85.2%	83.0%
Mean Age (SD)***	34.8 (11.1)	38.9 (14.3)	38.4 (15.4)	41.1 (15.1)
Race				
White	85.5	85.3	80.7	85.9
Black	10.2	9.3	14.8	5.9
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.8[a]	1.0[a]	----	1.5[a]
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.8[a]	1.8[a]	2.3[a]	3.0[a]
Multiracial	2.7[a]	2.8	2.3[a]	3.7[a]
Hispanic Origin				
Hispanic	7.9	8.8	11.5	9.7
Relationship status***				
Never married	35.6	37.2	35.2	27.4
Married	14.6	35.7	43.2	52.6
Divorced or separated	49.8	22.5	17.0	17.0
Widowed	----	4.6	4.5[a]	3.0[a]
Education				
Less than high school	11.9	8.8	19.3	11.9
High school	27.0	30.1	26.1	24.6
Some college	31.3	27.8	23.9	25.4
Associate degree	8.3	10.3	5.7[a]	6.7[a]
Bachelor degree	14.3	14.0	18.2	22.4
Graduate or professional degree	7.1	9.0	6.8[a]	9.0
Household income				
Less than $10,000	11.5	11.9	20.5	9.5
$10,000-19,999	20.7	15.0	17.9	16.4
$20,000-29,999	12.0	12.2	10.3[a]	17.2
$30,000-39,999	13.8	11.7	9.0[a]	12.9
$40,000-49,999	6.0	14.2	9.0[a]	8.6
$50,000-74,999	19.8	15.0	16.7	15.5
$75,000 or more	16.1	20.0	16.7	19.8

Note: Sample size varies due to missing cases.
[a] Based on less than 10 cases.

Nature of Stalking

Bivariate analyses were conducted to test the significance of association between stalking by the victim-offender relationship and the nature of the stalking incidents. The individual results for the frequencies of each of the variables across the four categories of victim-offender relationship are not discussed within the text, but are presented in Table 11; and the relationships which are significant at the bivariate level are discussed below. The bivariate results are not shown separately, but those relationships that are significant are denoted with an asterisk (*) within the table. The test statistics and results for the bivariate analyses are discussed below. Since the victim-offender relationship is a four-category variable and in order to reduce the potential of error due to multiple analyses, several adjustments were made. Dummy variables (4 total) were created to complete bivariate analyses and coded such that 1=known intimate stalking, 0=all other stalking, and 1=known other, 0=all other stalking, and so forth. If the overall bivariate analysis (using the four-category variable) was significant, further bivariate analyses were completed using these dummy variables to determine where the difference lies among the victim-offender relationship categories. A Bonferroni-type adjustment was used with an alpha level of .05 and four variables, and therefore, the new alpha level was set at .012 for all further analyses in this series using the dummy variables (Gardner, 2001; Mertler & Vannatta, 2010). These adjustments will be applied to all further analyses examining stalking by victim-offender relationship (Tables 11 through 13).

Stalking Behaviors Experienced by Victims

The types of stalking behaviors experienced varied across the sample. Respondents were allowed to give multiple responses as they could have experienced various types of stalking behaviors. Victims who were stalked by a current or former intimate partner were significantly more likely than victims who were stalked by all other offenders to have experienced unwanted phone calls and messages ($\chi^2(1)=22.74$; $p<.001$), unwanted letters, e-mails, or other written communication ($\chi^2(1)=10.20$; $p<.01$), their stalker showing up places where they had no business ($\chi^2(1)=29.63$; $p<.001$), their stalker leaving unwanted items ($\chi^2(1)=7.94$; $p<.01$), and the offender following or spying on them ($\chi^2(1)=22.43$; $p<.001$). And those who were stalked by other known offenders were significantly less likely than victims stalked by all other types of offenders to have experienced unwanted phone calls and messages ($\chi^2(1)=11.54$; $p<.01$) and being followed or spied on ($\chi^2(1)=10.39$; $p<.01$). Those stalked by a stranger were significantly less likely to have had their stalker post information or spread rumors about them ($\chi^2(1)=15.97$; $p<.001$). Overall, it appears that those victims who are stalked by a current or former intimate are more likely to experience many of the types of stalking behaviors than others.

Other Crimes Perpetrated Against Victims or Other Persons

Bivariate analyses were completed examining the association of the victim-offender relationship and other crimes perpetrated against victims or other persons by their stalker. No significant associations were found between attacks against other persons/pets or weapons used in the attacks and the victim-offender relationship. Significant associations were found among

property crimes, identity theft, attacks against the victim, physical injuries sustained and the victim-offender relationship, and these are discussed in further detail below.

Property Crimes and Identity Theft

Current or former intimate partner stalkers were more likely to have entered or attempted to enter a victim's home than other stalkers ($\chi^2(1)=13.74$; $p<.001$). Although the overall bivariate analysis of illegally entering victim's car or damage/destroy victim's property revealed a significant association, it was inappropriate to interpret as the tests were not robust as the minimum cell counts were not achieved (Healey, 2002). Overall, it does appear that intimate partner stalkers were more likely to have committed property offenses against their victims. Bivariate analyses of all identity theft variables revealed significant associations; however, the minimum cell counts were not achieved and therefore the assumptions of the chi-square distribution were not met and this test is not applicable.

Nature of Attack or Attempted Attack on Victims

Current or former intimate partner stalkers were significantly more likely than all other offenders to have attacked their victim by hitting, slapping, or knocking the victim down ($\chi^2(1)=51.57$; $p<.001$). Both those stalkers who were other known persons to the victim ($\chi^2(1)=12.04$; $p<.01$) and those who were unknown to the victim ($\chi^2(1)=6.92$; $p<.01$) were significantly less likely than all other stalkers to have attacked their victim by hitting, slapping, or knocking the victim down. Although the overall bivariate analyses of attacks on the victim by chocking or strangling, raping or sexually assaulting, attacking with a weapon, and chasing or dragging with a car revealed significant associations, it was inappropriate to interpret the chi-

square tests as the assumptions were not met since minimum cell counts were not achieved. Furthermore, it should be noted that significant associations were found among the no physical injuries sustained category and the bruises, black eye, cuts, etc. (physical injuries) category, but again the minimum cell counts were not achieved. Overall, it does appear that those who were stalked by a current or intimate partner were also more likely to have been attacked in some form.

Threats Made Against Victims

Further analyses were completed to examine associations between threats made against the victim and the victim-offender relationship. Overall bivariate analysis of threats to kill the victim, harm victim with a weapon, harm or kidnap victim's child, harm another family member, harm a pet, and harm or kill him/herself (the stalker) revealed significant associations, but the minimum cell counts were not achieved and therefore the assumptions of the chi-square distribution were not met and this test could not be applied.

Onset, Duration, and Frequency of Stalking

The onset/duration of stalking was measured by asking the victim how long ago they realized the behaviors were occurring. This variable was then coded into years to measure the duration of the stalking behaviors. This variable was then recoded into three categories (less than one year, one year to five years, more than five years), which is presented in Table 11. An analysis of variance was completed using the overall variable (in years), a significant difference in mean years of stalking occurrence in the victim-offender relationship was found ($F(3,856)=4.38$; $p<.01$). Post-hoc tests identified significant differences for known intimate

victim-offender category. Those who were stalked by a current or former intimate partner were significantly more likely than those stalked by a stranger or an unknown person to have experienced these behaviors for a longer duration of time.

Frequency of stalking is how often the stalking behaviors occurred. This variable was coded as (1) once or twice a year, (2) once or twice a month, (3) once or twice a week, (4) almost every day, (5) at least once a day recoded, and (6) no set pattern or sporadically. This variable was recoded leaving the 'no set pattern' category out, making it continuous, so that an analysis of variance could be completed. The analysis of variance revealed a significant difference in the mean frequency of stalking ($F(3,638)=3.44$; $p<.05$). Post-hoc tests identified significant differences for the known intimate category and the known other category. Both those who were stalked by a known current or former intimate partner and another known person experienced a significantly higher frequency of stalking behaviors than those stalked by strangers.

Finally, stalking victims were also questioned as to whether or not the behaviors were still ongoing. Those stalked by current or former intimate partners were more likely to report that the behaviors were still occurring when compared to others ($\chi^2(1)=10.25$; $p<.01$). And those stalked by strangers were less likely to report that the behaviors were still occurring when compared to others ($\chi^2(1)=9.12$; $p<.01$).

Additionally, it was examined whether the unwanted behaviors started when the victim was living with the offender. Among victims who were stalked by known intimate partners, 42.7% began while they were still living with their partner.

Table 11: Nature of Stalking by Victim-Offender Relationship

Variable	Known Intimate (N=256)	Known Other (N=400)	Stranger (N=88)	Unknown (N=135)
Stalking Behaviors Experienced by Victims[a]				
Unwanted phone calls and messages*	80.9%	63.5%	58.0%	71.9%
Unwanted letters, e-mails, or other written communication*	41.0	30.8	22.7	31.9
Following or spying*	49.6	35.0	33.0	25.2
Waiting for victim at various places	37.5	33.0	28.4	23.0
Showing up a places*	48.8	31.8	25.0	25.9
Leaving unwanted items, presents, or flowers*	19.9	15.3	5.7	8.9
Posting information or spreading rumors*	35.2	49.4	5.1	13.3
Other crimes perpetrated against victim[a]				
Property crimes				
Illegally entered house/apartment*	20.3	12.1	8.0[b]	9.0
Illegally entered car*	13.8	3.6	1.1[b]	3.8[b]
Damaged or destroyed property*	23.9	14.9	2.3[b]	10.5
Identity theft				
Charged items to credit card*	5.2	0.5[b]	----	1.6[b]
Opened/closed accounts*	8.0	1.8[b]	1.2[b]	1.6[b]
Took money from accounts*	7.6	2.0[b]	----	2.3[b]
Attack or attempt to attack[a]				
A child	4.7	4.1	3.4[b]	3.8[b]
Another family member	4.7	8.3	2.3[b]	6.7[b]
A friend or co-worker	4.7	6.8	2.3[b]	6.0[b]
A pet	5.5	4.8	1.1[b]	2.3[b]
Attacked or attempted to attack victim[a]				
Hit, slapped, or knocked down*	24.5	7.9	5.7[b]	5.3[b]
Choked or strangled*	9.6	2.0[b]	2.3[b]	----
Raped or sexually assaulted*	4.0	0.8[b]	1.1[b]	----
Attacked with a weapon*	8.4	3.6	1.1[b]	----
Chased or dragged with a car*	7.2	1.0[b]	3.4[b]	3.0[b]
Attacked in some other way	9.2	9.3	2.3[b]	6.7[b]

Variable	Known Intimate (N=256)	Known Other (N=400)	Stranger (N=88)	Unknown (N=135)
Weapon used in attack[a,c]				
Gun	23.8[b]	23.1[b]	100.0[b]	----
Knife or other sharp object	52.4	23.1	----	----
Blunt or other object	23.8[b]	53.8[b]	----	----
Physical injuries sustained in attack[a,d]				
None*	31.9	63.4	----	57.1
Raped	5.6[b]	----	16.7[b]	----
Attempted rape	1.4[b]	2.4[b]	----	----
Sexual assault	4.2[b]	----	----	----
Knife or stab wounds	2.8[b]	2.4[b]	----	----
Gunshot, bullet wounds	----	----	----	----
Broken bones or teeth knocked out	5.6[b]	2.4[b]	----	----
Internal injuries	1.4[b]	2.4[b]	----	----
Knocked unconscious	4.2[b]	2.4[b]	----	----
Bruises, black eye, cuts, scratches, swelling, chipped teeth*	63.9	22.0[b]	100.0[b]	28.6[b]
Other	5.6[b]	9.8[b]	16.7[b]	14.3[b]
Threats made against victims[a,d]				
Kill victim*	18.6	12.0	1.2[b]	12.6
Rape or sexually assault victim	3.8[b]	1.4[b]	----	1.6[b]
Harm victim with a weapon*	10.3	7.7	3.5[b]	3.3[b]
Hit, slap, or harm victim in some other way	19.0	14.4	7.0[b]	12.7
Harm or kidnap a child*	10.4	3.2	2.3[b]	4.1[b]
Harm another family member*	5.9	8.2	----	8.7
Harm a friend or co-worker	6.7	4.3	----	4.1[b]
Harm a pet*	3.8[b]	4.3	----	----
Harm or kill (himself/herself)*	19.1	8.1	----	2.4[b]
Threaten victim in some other way	19.7	16.1	8.0[b]	20.8
Onset/duration of stalking*				
Less than one year	41.4	54.2	81.4	58.3
One to five years	44.6	37.9	15.1	35.6
More than five years	13.9	7.9	3.5[b]	6.1[b]

Variable	Known Intimate (N=256)	Known Other (N=400)	Stranger (N=88)	Unknown (N=135)
Frequency of stalking*				
Once or twice a year	8.3	10.5	27.6	14.9
Once or twice a month	18.3	17.4	14.9	14.9
Once or twice a week	28.6	19.2	14.9	22.4
Almost every day	17.5	18.9	14.9	10.4
At least once a day	5.2	5.9	4.6[b]	10.4
No set pattern	22.2	28.1	23.0	26.9
Stalking behaviors still occurring*	44.9	34.5	20.8	36.7
Stalking behaviors while living w/intimate partner[e]	42.7	----	----	----

Sample size varies due to missing cases.
*Denotes significance at the bivariate level. [a] Multiple responses were allowed. [b] Based on less than 10 cases. [c] Only asked of those victims who were attacked with a weapon (N=36). [d] Only asked of those victims who were attacked physically, not with a car or in "some other way" (N=131). [e] Only asked of spouse/ex-spouse relationship or boy/girlfriend/ex-boy/girlfriend relationship where the victim indicated they had ever lived together.

Stalking Victims' Responses

Bivariate analyses were conducted to test the significance of association between stalking by the victim-offender relationship and the victims' responses to the behaviors. The individual results for the frequencies of each of the variables across the four categories of victim-offender relationship are not discussed within the test, but are presented in Table 12; and the relationships which are significant at the bivariate level are discussed below. The bivariate results are not shown separately, but those relationships that are significant are denoted with an asterisk (*) within the table. The test statistics and results for the bivariate analyses are discussed below. As previously mentioned, a Bonferroni-type adjustment was used with a new alpha level set at .012 for all further analyses in this series.

Why Victim Thought Perpetrator Began Stalking

Victims who were stalked by a current or former intimate partner were significantly more likely than those stalked by all other offenders to have reported that they felt this started because of the need to control them (the victim) ($\chi^2(1)=124.2$; $p<.001$) or the stalker was mentally ill or emotionally unstable ($\chi^2(1)=13.25$; $p<.001$). And those who were stalked by a current or former intimate partner were significantly less likely than those who were stalked by all other offenders to feel the reason was some "other" reason ($\chi^2(1)=16.47$; $p<.001$). Those victims who were stalked by another known person were significantly less likely than those stalked by all other offenders to report that the reasons it began was to control them ($\chi^2(1)=29.63$; $p<.001$). Victims who were stalked by a stranger were significantly less likely than those stalked by all other offenders to report that the stalking behaviors began for retaliation, to scare them, anger, or spite ($\chi^2(1)=17.07$; $p<.001$), to control them ($\chi^2(1)=32.74$; $p<.001$), and because the perpetrator was mentally ill or emotionally unstable ($\chi^2(1)=20.41$; $p<.001$). And victims who were stalked by a stranger were significantly more likely than those stalked by all other offenders to report that they did not know the reason the stalking began ($\chi^2(1)=71.50$; $p<.001$). Overall bivariate analyses examining associations between victim-offender relationship and reasons for perpetrator beginning to stalk revealed significant associations among the following reasons: because they wanted to catch the victim doing something, keep the victim in relationship, because the victim liked the attention, and because the perpetrator was a substance abuser; however, the cells had expected frequencies of 5 or less and therefore the assumptions of chi-square distribution were no longer met.

How Victims Felt

Bivariate analyses were first completed for associations between how victims felt when the behaviors first began and the victim-offender relationship. Victims who were stalked by current or former intimate partners were significantly more likely than those stalked by all other offenders to report they felt frightened ($\chi^2(1)=9.27$; $p<.01$), depressed ($\chi^2(1)=20.77$; $p<.001$) helpless ($\chi^2(1)=7.76$; $p<.01$), and sick ($\chi^2(1)=21.43$; $p<.001$). Those victims who were stalked by other known persons were significantly less likely than those stalked by all other offenders to report they felt frightened ($\chi^2(1)=6.38$; $p=.012$) and depressed ($\chi^2(1)=7.31$; $p<.01$). And victims of stranger stalking were significantly less likely than victims stalked by all other offenders to report that they felt sick ($\chi^2(1)=7.81$; $p<.01$).

Second, analyses were completed to examine how the victims felt when the stalking progressed. Bivariate analyses revealed significant associations with victims feeling depressed, helpless, and sick as the stalking progressed; however the minimum cell counts were not achieved and therefore the assumptions of the chi-square distribution were not met and this test was not applicable.

Victims' Worst Fears

Victims of intimate partner stalking were significantly more likely than those stalked by all other offenders to report that their worst fear was death ($\chi^2(1)=10.98$; $p<.01$), that the perpetrator would harm or kidnap their child ($\chi^2(1)=9.32$; $p<.01$), and loss of freedom ($\chi^2(1)=7.98$; $p<.01$). Those who were stalked by known others were significantly more likely

than those stalked by all other offenders to report that their worst fear was that the perpetrator would harm another family member ($\chi^2(1)=9.87$; $p<.01$).

Victims' Definition of the Behaviors

No significant bivariate relationships were found among victim-offender relationship and whether or not the unwanted behaviors were defined as stalking.

Table 12: Stalking Victims' Responses to Victimization by Victim-Offender Relationship

Variable	Known Intimate (N=256)	Known Other (N=400)	Stranger (N=88)	Unknown (N=135)
Why perpetrator started stalking[a]				
For retaliation/anger/spite*	42.6	37.5	17.0	39.6
Catch victim doing something*	10.9	2.5	----	2.2[b]
Control victim*	62.1	24.8	6.8[b]	27.6
Keep victim in relationship*	50.8	4.0	----	2.2[b]
Thought I liked the attention*	1.2[b]	5.0	----	0.7[b]
Substance abuser*	21.1	12.2	4.5[b]	17.2
Mentally ill/emotionally unstable	34.0	26.0	5.7[b]	21.6
Perpetrator liked attention	10.9	10.0	4.5[b]	6.7[b]
Liked victim/found victim attractive/had crush on victim*	18.4	19.8	10.2[b]	10.4
Different cultural beliefs/background	5.1	4.5	1.1[b]	2.2[b]
Proximity/convenience/victim was alone	7.0	6.5	6.8[b]	7.5
Other*	10.5	20.5	26.1	25.4
Don't know*	3.1[b]	6.5	33.0	10.4
How victim felt when stalking began[a]				
Anxious/concerned	52.7	51.3	58.0	53.7
Annoyed/angry	68.0	70.3	60.2	73.1
Frightened*	51.6	39.0	45.5	41.0
Depressed*	25.0	12.5	9.1[b]	14.9
Helpless*	29.3	22.8	13.6	18.7
Sick*	25.0	13.0	5.7[b]	14.9
Suicidal	3.1[b]	1.3[b]	1.1[b]	----
Some other way	9.0	9.0	4.5[b]	3.0[b]

Variable	Known Intimate (N=256)	Known Other (N=400)	Stranger (N=88)	Unknown (N=135)
How victim felt when stalking progressed[a]				
No change in feelings	31.1	32.7	31.8	26.1
Anxious/concerned	23.0	24.4	29.5	26.1
Annoyed/angry	42.6	45.2	34.1	52.2
Frightened	26.2	24.9	27.3	25.4
Depressed*	14.8	6.8	2.3[b]	6.7[b]
Helpless*	18.8	12.8	5.7[b]	11.9
Sick*	10.5	7.8	1.1[b]	8.2
Suicidal	1.2[b]	0.8[b]	----	----
Some other way	7.8	6.5	6.8[b]	8.2
Victims' worst fears[a]				
Death*	13.7	7.3	5.7[b]	6.0[b]
Physical/bodily harm	34.1	28.0	33.0	29.9
Harm or kidnap child*	19.2	10.5	8.0[b]	16.4
Harm current partner	5.9	7.8	4.5[b]	3.7[b]
Harm other family members*	9.0	16.3	6.8[b]	11.2
Loss of job	5.9	8.5	1.1[b]	6.0[b]
Loss of freedom*	14.5	9.0	6.8[b]	6.7[b]
Behavior would never stop	31.4	31.3	18.2	28.4
Not knowing what might happen next*	41.2	48.4	58.0	47.8
Lose mind	6.7	3.5	1.1[b]	6.0[b]
Other	14.1	16.0	13.6	23.9
Don't know	5.1	5.8	3.4[b]	4.5[b]
Victim defined behaviors as stalking	60.0	50.6	52.4	48.1

Sample size varies due to missing cases.
*Denotes significance at the bivariate level. [a] Multiple responses were allowed. [b] Based on less than 10 cases.

Victims' Reactions and Consequences of Victimization

Bivariate analyses were conducted to test the significance of association between stalking by victim-offender relationship and the victims' reaction to and consequences of the behaviors. The individual results for the frequencies of each of the variables across the four categories of

victim-offender relationship are not discussed within the test, but are presented in Table 13; and the relationships which are significant at the bivariate level are discussed below. The bivariate results are not shown separately, but those relationships that are significant are denoted with an asterisk (*) within the table. The test statistics and results for the bivariate analyses are discussed below. As previously mentioned, a Bonferroni-type adjustment was used new alpha level set at .012 for all further analyses in this series.

Actions Taken by Victim for Protection

Victims of intimate partner stalking were significantly more likely than those victims stalked by all other offenders to have taken time off from work or school ($\chi^2(1)=18.79$; $p<.001$), changed their usual activities outside of work or school ($\chi^2(1)=18.20$; $p<.001$), stayed with friends or relatives ($\chi^b(1)=65.46$; $p<.001$), changed telephone numbers ($\chi^2(1)=23.15$; $p<.001$), installed caller ID or call blocking ($\chi^2(1)=7.39$; $p<.01$), and changed or installed new locks or security system ($\chi^2(1)=21.25$; $p<.001$). Victims stalked by current or former intimate partners were significantly less likely than those stalked by all other offenders to have not changed their behaviors ($\chi^2(1)=32.79$; $p<.001$). Those who were stalked by known others were significantly less likely than those stalked by all other offenders to have stayed with friends or relatives ($\chi^2(1)=12.90$; $p<.001$),and changed or installed new locks or security system ($\chi^2(1)=9.24$; $p<.01$). Those stalked by strangers were significantly less likely to have taken time off from work or school ($\chi^2(1)=9.009$; $p<.01$), changed their usual activities ($\chi^2(1)=9.45$; $p<.01$), and stayed with friends or relatives ($\chi^2(1)=9.30$; $p<.01$). Those who were stalked by a stranger were significantly more likely than those stalked by all other offenders to have not changed their

behaviors ($\chi^2(1)=22.90$; $p<.001$). And those who were stalked by an unknown person were significantly less likely than those stalked by all other offenders to have stayed with friends or relatives ($\chi^2(1)=6.29$; $p=.012$). Overall bivariate analyses revealed significant associations for the following protective actions taken by victims: changed or quit job or school, changed route to school or work, altered appearance, got pepper spray, and changed e-mail address ; however the minimum cell counts were not achieved and therefore the assumptions of the chi-square distribution were not met and this test was not applicable. Overall it appears that victims who were stalked by a current or former intimate partner were more likely to have taken actions to protect themselves.

Help Sought by Victims

Victims of intimate partner stalking were significantly more likely than those stalked by all other offenders to have enlisted the help of friends or family ($\chi^2(1)=15.45$; $p<.001$), asked people to not release information about them ($\chi^2(1)=30.43$; $p<.001$), and obtained a restraining order ($\chi^2(1)=64.57$; $p<.001$). And victims of intimate partner stalking were significantly less likely than those stalked by all other offenders to have not sought any help ($\chi^2(1)=26.16$; $p<.001$). Those stalked by another known person were significantly less likely than those stalked by all other offenders to have obtained a restraining order ($\chi^2(1)=14.11$; $p<.001$). Victims of stranger stalking were significantly less likely than those stalked by all other offenders to have enlisted the help of friends or family ($\chi^2(1)=7.11$; $p<.01$), asked people to not release information about them ($\chi^2(1)=7.53$; $p<.01$), and obtained a restraining order ($\chi^2(1)=6.53$; $p<.012$). And victims of stranger stalking were significantly more likely than those stalked by all other

offenders to have not sought any help ($\chi^2(1)=28.27$; $p<.001$). Those stalked by an unknown person were significantly less likely than those stalked by all other offenders to have obtained a restraining order ($\chi^2(1)=7.89$; $p<.01$). Overall bivariate analyses revealed significant associations for the following help sought by victims: talked to an attorney, contacted victim services/shelter/help line, talked to a mental health professional, talked to a doctor or nurse, and talked to clergy/faith leader; however the minimum cell counts were not achieved and this no longer followed the assumptions of the chi-square distribution. Again, it appears that those stalked by current or former intimate partners are also seeking more help than those stalked by other offenders. And interestingly, it seems from these comparisons that the main difference lies between those stalked by a current or former intimate partner and those stalked by a stranger.

Report to Police

Victims who were stalked by current or former intimate partners were significantly more likely than those stalked by all other offenders to have reported the stalking to the police ($\chi^2(1)=6.28$; $p=.012$). And victims who were stalked by other known persons were significantly less likely than those stalked by all other offenders to report the stalking to the police ($\chi^2(1)=11.68$; $p<.01$).

Consequences of Stalking Victimization

Overall bivariate analyses revealed significant associations for those victims who moved or lost time from work because of the stalking; however the minimum cell counts were not achieved and therefore the assumptions of the chi-square distribution were not met and this test could not be applied.

Table 13: Stalking Victims' Reactions to and Consequences of Victimization by Victim-Offender Relationship

Variable	Known Intimate (N=256)	Known Other (N=400)	Stranger (N=88)	Unknown (N=135)
Actions taken to protect victim[a]				
Took time off from work or school*	25.8	15.8	5.7[b]	12.6
Changed or quit job or school*	15.6	9.0	2.3[b]	5.2[b]
Changed route to work or school*	21.5	9.5	4.5[b]	12.6
Avoided family/friends*	23.8	14.3	4.5[b]	10.4
Changed usual activities*	31.3	20.3	9.1[b]	17.8
Stayed with family/friends*	35.5	13.5	6.8[b]	11.1
Altered appearance*	3.9	1.0[b]	1.1[b]	4.4[b]
Took self-defense classes	2.7[b]	0.8[b]	----	0.7[b]
Got pepper spray*	9.8	6.3	2.3[b]	3.7[b]
Got a gun	3.1[b]	3.3	2.3[b]	2.2[b]
Got another kind of weapon	2.7[b]	1.5[b]	----	3.0[b]
Changed social security number	0.8	----	----	----
Changed e-mail address*	12.1	4.3	2.3[b]	8.1
Changed telephone number*	26.2	14.3	8.0[b]	11.9
Installed caller ID/call blocking*	24.6	15.8	17.0	19.3
Changed or installed new locks or security system	22.3	10.0	6.8[b]	14.1
Did not change behaviors*	24.2	41.5	62.5	43.5
Help sought by victims[a]				
Enlisted help of friends/family*	53.1	42.0	29.5	34.8
Asked people not to release information*	47.3	30.8	20.5	24.4
Hired a private investigator	2.0[b]	0.8[b]	1.1[b]	2.2[b]
Talked to an attorney*	37.5	18.3	3.4[b]	15.6
Contact victim services/shelter/help line*	58.0	30.4	5.8[b]	5.8[b]
Obtained a restraining/protection/stay away order*	32.0	11.3	6.8[b]	8.1
Talked to a mental health professional*	21.9	10.5	4.5[b]	13.3
Talked to a doctor or nurse*	16.8	8.5	3.4[b]	6.7[b]
Talked to clergy/faith leader*	14.5	8.5	5.7[b]	10.4
Talked to boss/employer	25.8	22.8	12.5	22.2
Contacted building/office security	10.5	10.0	5.7[b]	11.9
Did not seek help*	16.8	28.8	53.4	37.0
Reported to police*	49.0	36.3	42.0	48.9

Variable	Known Intimate (N=256)	Known Other (N=400)	Stranger (N=88)	Unknown (N=135)
Moved*	28.5	8.8	3.4[b]	10.4
If moved, where to[a]				
A different house/apartment	53.4	60.0	66.7[b]	50.0[b]
A different city/state	49.3	51.4	33.3[b]	50.0[b]
A shelter or safe house	6.8[b]	2.9[b]	33.3[b]	----
Some other place	2.7[b]	2.9[b]	----	----
Lost job	5.1	3.8	1.1[b]	2.3[b]
Reason lost time from work				
Fear or concern for safety	22.9	13.8	3.8[b]	16.4
Getting a restraining/protection order or testifying in court	27.1	9.0	5.8[b]	15.1
Changing phone number/moving/fixing damaged property	16.1	4.3	3.8[b]	8.3

Sample size varies due to missing cases.
*Denotes significance at the bivariate level. [a] Multiple responses were allowed. [b] Based on less than 10 cases.

Examining Stalking Type

The next analyses examine stalking victimization by type of stalking. Specifically the type of stalking experienced was coded into three categories – cyberstalking, stalking with technology (electronic monitoring), or no experience of either cyberstalking or stalking with technology (traditional stalking). And, as previously mentioned, due to the small sample size in the both cyberstalked and stalked with technology category, these respondents were excluded from all further analysis as there were not enough in this category to complete meaningful analysis. These next analyses and all further analyses are completed for stalking victims only.

Victim Characteristics

Bivariate analyses were conducted to test the significance of association between the type of stalking and the victim characteristics. The individual results for the frequencies of each of the variables across the three categories of stalking are not discussed within the test, but are presented in Table 14; and the relationships which are significant at the bivariate level are discussed below. The bivariate results are not shown separately, but those relationships that are significant are denoted with an asterisk (*) within the table. The test statistics and results for the bivariate analyses are discussed below. Since the stalking type is a three-categorical variable and in order to reduce the potential of error due to multiple analyses, a Bonferroni-type adjustment was used with an alpha level of .05 and three variables, the new alpha level will be set at .016 for all further analyses in this series.

Gender

Overall, the majority of victims who were cyberstalked, stalked with technology, and traditionally stalked were female. Bivariate analyses reveal that those who were traditionally stalked were more likely than all others (i.e. those who were cyberstalked and stalked with technology) to have been female ($\chi^2(1)=8.22$, $p<.01$). Further, the majority of offenders who cyberstalked, stalked with technology, and traditionally stalked victims were male.

Age

The mean age for those who were cyberstalked (Mean=36.4) was slightly lower than the mean age for those who were stalked with technology (Mean=39.3) and traditionally stalked

(Mean=39.1). Bivariate analyses did not reveal any significant differences in the ages of those who were stalked in different manners.

Race and Ethnicity

The majority of all victims, regardless of stalking victimization type, were white and of non-Hispanic origin. There were no significant differences found among stalking type and race or Hispanic origin.

Relationship Status

The modal relationship status category for those victims who were cyberstalked was never married. The modal relationship status category for those victims who were stalked with technology was divorced or separated. And the modal relationship status category for those victims who were traditionally stalked was married. Significant bivariate associations were found between type of stalking and relationship status, but the cells had expected frequencies of 5 or less and this could no longer be precisely described by the chi-square distribution.

Educational Attainment

The median education category for those who were cyberstalked was some college. The median education category for those who were stalked with technology was high school. And the median education category for those who were traditionally stalked was some college. An analysis of variance revealed a significant difference in the mean education in the three categories of stalking type ($F(2,943)=7.91$, $p<.001$). Post-hoc tests identified significant differences for those who were cyberstalked. Those who were cyberstalked had a significantly

higher mean education than both those who were stalked with technology and those who were traditionally stalked.

Income

The median income for those who were cyberstalked was $40,000-49,999. The median income for those who were stalked with technology was $30,000-39,999. And the median income for those who were traditionally stalked was $30,000-39,999. An analysis of variance revealed a significant difference in the mean income in the three categories of stalking type ($F(2,830)=8.57$, $p<.001$). Post-hoc tests identified significant differences for those who were cyberstalked. Those who were cyberstalked had a significantly higher income than those who were traditionally stalked.

Table 14: Examining Demographic Characteristics by Stalking Type

Variable	Cyberstalked (N=163)	Stalked with Technology (N=44)	Traditional (N=747)
Gender*			
Female	69.3%	63.6%	77.8%
Mean Age (SD)	36.4 (12.4)	39.3 (11.8)	39.1 (14.9)
Race			
White	87.1	90.9	83.8
Black	8.6	4.5[a]	10.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	1.2[a]	----	0.9[a]
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.2[a]	2.3[a]	2.4
Multiracial	1.8[a]	2.3[a]	2.7
Hispanic Origin			
Hispanic	9.3	4.5[a]	8.8
Relationship status*			
Never married	41.6	13.6[a]	34.0
Married	31.1	36.4	34.8
Divorced or separated	26.1	47.7	27.0
Widowed	1.2[a]	2.3[a]	4.3
Education*			
Less than high school	6.7	13.6[a]	12.9
High school	20.2	38.6	30.3
Some college	30.1	22.7	26.9
Associate degree	11.7	11.4[a]	7.8
Bachelor degree	22.1	11.4[a]	14.1
Graduate or professional degree	9.2	2.3[a]	8.0
Household income*			
Less than $10,000	5.7[a]	8.3[a]	15.1
$10,000-19,999	12.9	25.0	17.7
$20,000-29,999	7.6	13.9	13.4
$30,000-39,999	12.1	8.3[a]	12.3
$40,000-49,999	15.0	19.4[a]	9.1
$50,000-74,999	23.6	11.1[a]	14.8
$75,000 or more	22.1	13.9[a]	17.7

Sample size varies due to missing cases.
*Denotes significance at the bivariate level. [a] Based on less than 10 cases.

Nature of Stalking by Stalking Type

Bivariate analyses were conducted to test the significance of association between the type of stalking and the nature of stalking. The individual results for the frequencies of each of the variables across the three categories of stalking are not discussed within the test, but are presented in Table 15; and the relationships which are significant at the bivariate level are discussed below. The bivariate results are not shown separately, but those relationships that are significant are denoted with an asterisk (*) within the table. The test statistics and results for the bivariate analyses are discussed below. The Bonferroni-type adjustment was used with an adjusted alpha level of .016 for all further analyses in this series.

Stalking Behaviors Experienced by Victims

Victims who were cyberstalked were more significantly more likely than those who were stalked with technology or traditionally stalked to have experienced unwanted letters, e-mails, or other written communication ($\chi^2(1)=129.80$; $p<.001$), their stalker leaving unwanted items ($\chi^2(1)=10.19$; $p<.01$), and their stalker posting information or spreading rumors about them online, in a public place, or by word of mouth ($\chi^2(1)=17.36$; $p<.001$). Victims who were stalked with technology were significantly more likely than those victims who were cyberstalked or traditionally stalked to have experienced the offender following or spying on them ($\chi^2(1)=14.42$; $p<.001$), their stalker waiting for them at various places ($\chi^2(1)=9.84$; $p<.01$), and their stalker showing up places where they had no business ($\chi^2(1)=27.79$; $p<.001$). And those who traditionally stalked were significantly less likely than those who were cyberstalked or stalked with technology to have experienced unwanted letters, e-mails, or other written communication

($\chi^2(1)=100.36$; $p<.001$), being followed or spied on ($\chi^2(1)=8.66$; $p<.01$), their stalker showing up at places ($\chi^2(1)=8.10$; $p<.01$), their stalked leaving unwanted items ($\chi^2(1)=8.20$; $p<.01$) and their stalker posting information or spreading rumors about them ($\chi^2(1)=24.15$; $p<.001$). Overall, it appears that those who were cyberstalked experienced more of the communication behaviors and those who were stalked with technology experienced more of the physical behaviors.

Other Crimes Perpetrated Against Victims or Other Persons

Bivariate analyses were completed examining the association of the type of stalking and the other crimes perpetrated against victims or other persons. No significant associations were found among attacks against other persons/pets, weapons used in the attacks, or physical injuries sustained and the type of stalking. Significant associations were found among property crimes, attacks against the victim, and the type of stalking, and are discussed in further detail below.

Property Crimes and Identity Theft

Those who were stalked with technology were significantly more likely than those who were cyberstalked or traditionally stalked to have had the stalker enter or attempt to enter their home ($\chi^2(1)=14.41$; $p<.001$) and have had the stalker damage or destroy their property ($\chi^2(1)=8.80$; $p<.01$). Those who were traditionally stalked were significantly less likely than those who were cyberstalked or stalked with technology to have had their stalker damage or destroy their property ($\chi^2(1)=9.62$; $p<.01$). Overall, it appears that those who are stalked with technology are more likely to experience property offenses as well. Bivariate analysis of the association between stalking type and the identity theft crime of opening or closing the victim's

account was significant; yet, the minimum cell counts were not achieved and therefore the assumptions of the chi-square distribution were not met.

Nature of Attack or Attempted Attack on Victims

Although the overall bivariate analysis of attacks on the victim with a weapon revealed significant associations, the assumptions of the chi-square distribution were not met as the minimum cell counts were not achieved. There were no further significant associations found among the nature of attacks on victims and stalking type.

Threats Made Against Victims

Further analyses were completed to examine associations between threats made against the victim and the type of stalking. The overall bivariate analysis of threats to rape or sexually assault the victim revealed significant associations, yet the minimum cell counts were not achieved and therefore the assumptions of the chi-square distribution were not met and this test was not applicable. Victims who were stalked with technology were significantly more likely than those who were cyberstalked or traditionally stalked to have received threats of being harmed with a weapon ($\chi^2(1)=11.26$; $p<.01$), being hit, slapped, or harmed in some other way ($\chi^2(1)=8.27$; $p<.01$) and having a friend or co-worker harmed ($\chi^2(1)=6.89$; $p<.01$). And those who were traditionally stalked were significantly less likely than those who were cyberstalked or stalked with technology to have received other types of threats ($\chi^2(1)=5.94$; $p<.01$). Overall, it appears that those who were stalked with technology were more likely to have received threats by their stalker.

Onset, Duration, and Frequency of Stalking

An analysis of variance was completed comparing the mean years of stalking occurrence by stalking type and no significant difference was found. An analysis of variance revealed a significant difference in the mean frequency of stalking in the three categories of stalking type ($F(2,687)=6.49$; $p<.01$). Post-hoc tests identified significant differences for those stalked with technology. Those who were stalked with technology experienced a significantly higher frequency of stalking behaviors than those who were traditionally stalked. With regard to whether the stalking was still occurring, those stalked with technology were significantly more likely to have reported that the behaviors were still occurring when compared to those who were cyberstalked or traditionally stalked ($\chi^2(1)=10.60$; $p<.01$).

Table 15: Characteristics of Stalking Behaviors Experienced by Stalking Type

Variable	Cyberstalked (N=163)	Stalked with Technology (N=44)	Traditional (N=747)
Stalking Behaviors Experienced by Victims[a]			
Unwanted phone calls and messages	72.4%	54.4%	68.7%
Unwanted letters, e-mails, or other written communication*	70.6	27.3	24.5
Following or spying*	40.5	63.6	34.3
Waiting for victim at various places*	30.1	52.3	29.9
Showing up a places*	34.4	70.5	31.5
Leaving unwanted items, presents, or flowers*	22.1	13.6	13.4
Posting information or spreading rumors*	53.4	54.4	34.8
Other crimes perpetrated against victim[a]			
Property Crimes			
Illegally entered house/apartment*	9.9	31.8	12.6
Illegally entered car	8.7	9.5[b]	5.2
Damaged or destroyed property*	18.6	29.5	12.4

Variable	Cyberstalked (N=163)	Stalked with Technology (N=44)	Traditional (N=747)
Identity Theft			
Charged items to credit card	----	----	2.5[b]
Opened/closed accounts*	7.6	4.8[b]	1.8
Took money from accounts	3.8[b]	4.9[b]	2.6
Attack or attempt to attack[a]			
A child	2.5[b]	6.8[b]	3.9
Another family member	4.9[b]	11.4[b]	5.9
A friend or co-worker	6.2	11.4[b]	4.2
A pet	1.9[b]	6.8[b]	3.7
Attacked or attempted to attack victim[a]			
Hit, slapped, or knocked down	11.7	11.6[b]	10.9
Choked or strangled	3.1[b]	7.0[b]	3.3
Raped or sexually assaulted	1.9[b]	2.3[b]	1.2[b]
Attacked with a weapon*	1.2[b]	11.6[b]	3.5
Chased or dragged with a car	3.7[b]	7.0[b]	2.9
Attacked in some other way	8.1	14.0[b]	6.2
Weapon used in attack[a,c]			
Gun	----	40.0[b]	23.1[b]
Knife or other sharp object	100.00[b]	40.0[b]	38.5
Blunt or other object	----	20.0[b]	38.5
Physical injuries sustained in attack[a,d]			
None	45.5	14.3[b]	46.8
Raped	4.5[b]	----	4.3[b]
Attempted rape	----	----	2.1[b]
Sexual assault	9.1[b]	----	1.1[b]
Knife or stab wounds	4.5[b]	14.3[b]	1.1[b]
Gunshot, bullet wounds	----	----	----
Broken bones or teeth knocked out	----	----	5.3[b]
Internal injuries	----	----	2.1[b]
Knocked unconscious	----	14.3[b]	2.1[b]
Bruises, black eye, cuts, scratches, swelling, chipped teeth	45.5	71.4[b]	45.7
Other	4.5[b]	----	7.4[b]

Variable	Cyberstalked (N=163)	Stalked with Technology (N=44)	Traditional (N=747)
Threats made against victims[a]			
Kill victim	10.5	21.4[b]	12.3
Rape or sexually assault victim*	1.4[b]	7.7[b]	1.4
Harm victim with a weapon*	7.3	20.5[b]	6.3
Hit, slap, or harm victim in some other way*	13.5	29.3	13.3
Harm or kidnap a child	4.7[b]	5.1[b]	5.4
Harm another family member	6.5	10.3[b]	6.4
Harm a friend or co-worker*	6.1[b]	12.8[b]	3.6
Harm a pet	1.4[b]	7.7[b]	2.7
Harm or kill (himself/herself)	11.3	7.7[b]	8.3
Threaten victim in some other way*	19.4	27.5	13.9
Onset/duration of stalking			
Less than one year	53.8	28.6	54.9
One to five years	40.0	59.5	35.4
More than five years	6.3	11.9	9.8
Frequency of stalking*			
Once or twice a year	8.1	2.3[b]	13.4
Once or twice a month	16.1	11.6[b]	17.7
Once or twice a week	24.8	23.3	21.6
Almost every day	18.6	25.6	14.9
At least once a day	5.0[b]	14.0[b]	6.1
No set pattern	27.3	23.3	26.3
Stalking behaviors still occurring*	35.6	62.5	37.2

Sample size varies due to missing cases.
*Denotes significance at the bivariate level. [a] Multiple responses were allowed. [b] Based on less than 10 cases. [c] Only asked of those victims who were attacked with a weapon (N=36). [d] Only asked of those victims who were attacked physically, not with a car or in "some other way" (N=131).

Victims' Responses to Stalking by Type of Stalking

Bivariate analyses were conducted to test the significance of association between the type of stalking and victims' responses to stalking. The individual results for the frequencies of each of the variables across the three categories of stalking are not discussed within the test, but are presented in Table 16; and the relationships which are significant at the bivariate level are discussed below. The bivariate results are not shown separately, but those relationships that are significant are denoted with an asterisk (*) within the table. The test statistics and results for the bivariate analyses are discussed below. The Bonferroni-type adjustment was used with an adjusted alpha level of .016 for all further analyses in this series.

Why Victim Thought Perpetrator Began Stalking

Victims who were cyberstalked were significantly more likely than those who were stalked with technology or traditionally stalked to have reported that they felt the perpetrator did so to control them ($\chi^2(1)=10.97$; $p<.01$). Victims who were traditionally stalked were significantly less likely than those who were cyberstalked or stalked with technology to have reported that they felt the perpetrator did so to control them ($\chi^2(1)=16.22$; $p<.001$). Overall bivariate analyses of associations between reasons why the victim felt the perpetrator began stalking (specifically, the perpetrator wanted to catch the victim doing something, because the perpetrator was a substance abuser, and because the perpetrator liked the victim) and the stalking type revealed significant associations; however the minimum cell counts were not achieved and therefore the assumptions of the chi-square distribution were not met.

How Victims Felt

Bivariate analyses were first completed for associations between how victims felt when the behaviors first began and the type of stalking. Victims who were traditionally stalked were significantly less likely than those who were cyberstalked or stalked with technology to have reported that they felt annoyed or angry ($\chi^2(1)=6.30$; $p<.016$). Victims who were stalked with technology were significantly more likely than those cyberstalked or traditionally stalked to report that they felt helpless ($\chi^2(1)=9.82$; $p<.01$).

Analyses were then completed to examine how the victims felt when the stalking progressed. Victims who were stalked with technology were significantly more likely than those who were cyberstalked or traditionally stalked to report that they felt depressed ($\chi^2(1)=6.94$; $p<.01$) and helpless ($\chi^2(1)=11.50$; $p<.01$) as the stalking progressed. Those who were traditionally stalked were significantly less likely than those who were cyberstalked or stalked with technology to report that they felt depressed ($\chi^2(1)=8.55$; $p<.01$) or helpless ($\chi^2(1)=8.72$; $p<.01$).

Victims' Worst Fears

Victims who were cyberstalked were significantly more likely than those who were stalked with technology or traditionally stalked to have reported their worst fear as not knowing what might happen next ($\chi^2(1)=6.07$; $p<.01$). Victims who were traditionally stalked were significantly less likely than those who were cyberstalked or stalked with technology to have reported their worst fear as not knowing what might happen next ($\chi^2(1)=6.82$; $p<.01$). Those who were stalked with technology were significantly more likely than those who were

cyberstalked or traditionally stalked to have reported their worst fear as losing their mind ($\chi^2(1)=6.20$; $p<.016$).

Victims' Definition of the Behaviors

Bivariate analyses revealed that those who were cyberstalked were significantly more likely than those who were stalked with technology or traditionally stalked to have defined the behaviors they experienced as stalking ($\chi^2(1)=13.36$; $p<.001$). Those who were stalked with technology were significantly more likely than those who were cyberstalked or traditionally stalked to have defined the behaviors as stalking ($\chi^2(1)=15.84$; $p<.001$). And those who were traditionally stalked were significantly less likely than those who were cyberstalked or stalked with technology to have defined the behaviors as stalking ($\chi^2(1)=28.75$; $p<.01$). Perhaps the addition of behaviors being experienced (e.g. cyberstalking and stalking with technology) causes victims to consider the behaviors as stalking.

Table 16: Stalking Victims' Responses to Victimization by Stalking Type

Variable	Cyberstalked (N=163)	Stalked with Technology (N=44)	Traditional (N=747)
Why perpetrator started stalking[a]			
For retaliation/anger/spite	38.7	43.2	35.0
Catch victim doing something*	7.4	9.1[b]	3.5
Control victim*	42.9	45.5	28.7
Keep victim in relationship	19.6	9.1[b]	15.0
Thought I liked the attention	4.3[b]	2.3[b]	2.3
Substance abuser*	8.6	9.1[b]	16.6
Mentally ill/emotionally unstable	25.2	22.7	24.0
Perpetrator liked attention	9.8	6.8[b]	8.7
Liked victim/found victim attractive/had crush on victim*	23.9	6.8[b]	14.2
Different cultural beliefs/background	5.5[b]	9.1[b]	3.2
Proximity/convenience/victim was alone	5.5[b]	11.4[b]	7.0
Other	16.6	27.3	19.9
Don't know	6.1[b]	6.8[b]	11.9
How victim felt when stalking began[a]			
Anxious/concerned	56.4	54.5	51.5
Annoyed/angry*	74.2	79.5	66.2
Frightened	39.3	34.1	43.9
Depressed	18.4	13.6[b]	15.0
Helpless*	23.3	40.9	20.4
Sick	16.6	15.9[b]	14.6
Suicidal	1.8[b]	4.5[b]	1.2[b]
Some other way	9.2	4.5[b]	7.4
How victim felt when stalking progressed[a]			
No change in feelings	29.6	27.3	33.6
Anxious/concerned	27.8	31.8	22.7
Annoyed/angry	47.5	50.0	41.7
Frightened	23.5	36.4	23.9
Depressed*	11.1	18.2[b]	6.5
Helpless*	16.0	29.5	11.2
Sick	9.9	11.4[b]	6.5
Suicidal	1.2[b]	2.3[b]	0.4[b]
Some other way	10.5	6.8[b]	6.3

Variable	Cyberstalked (N=163)	Stalked with Technology (N=44)	Traditional (N=747)
Victims' worst fears[a]			
Death	6.7	15.9[b]	8.6
Physical/bodily harm	25.2	40.9	31.0
Harm or kidnap child	15.3	15.9	12.9
Harm current partner	8.0	4.5[b]	5.8
Harm other family members	10.4	15.9[b]	12.6
Loss of job	8.6	9.1[b]	5.2
Loss of freedom	11.0	13.6	8.9
Behavior would never stop	31.3	34.1	27.8
Not knowing what might happen next*	55.8	52.3	44.8
Lose mind*	3.7[b]	11.4[b]	3.8
Other	17.8	9.1[b]	16.6
Don't know	4.3[b]	4.5[b]	5.4
Victim defined behaviors as stalking*	64.8	81.4	47.1

Sample size varies due to missing cases.
*Denotes significance at the bivariate level. [a] Multiple responses were allowed. [b] Based on less than 10 cases.

Stalking Victims' Reactions and Consequences of Victimization by Stalking Type

Bivariate analyses were conducted to test the significance of association between the type of stalking and victims' reactions to and consequences of stalking. The individual results for the frequencies of each of the variables across the three categories of stalking are not discussed within the test, but are presented in Table 17; and the relationships which are significant at the bivariate level are discussed below. The bivariate results are not shown separately, but those relationships that are significant are denoted with an asterisk (*) within the table. The test statistics and results for the bivariate analyses are discussed below. The Bonferroni-type adjustment was used with an adjusted alpha level of .016 for all further analyses in this series.

Actions Taken by Victim for Protection

Victims of cyberstalking were significantly more likely than victims who were stalked with technology or traditionally stalked to have taken time off from work or school ($\chi^2(1)=9.38$; $p<.01$), changed or quit a job or school ($\chi^2(1)=9.83$; $p<.01$), avoided family or friends ($\chi^2(1)=13.58$; $p<.001$), and changed their usual activities ($\chi^2(1)=9.03$; $p<.01$). Victims who were cyberstalked were significantly less likely than those who were stalked with technology or traditionally stalked to have not changed their behaviors ($\chi^2(1)=9.17$; $p<.01$). Victims who were stalked with technology were significantly more likely than those who were cyberstalked or traditionally stalked to have taken time off from work or school ($\chi^2(1)=8.69$; $p<.001$), changed the way they went to work or school ($\chi^2(1)=12.56$; $p<.001$), avoided family or friends ($\chi^2(1)=6.54$; $p<.016$), changed their usual activities ($\chi^2(1)=8.97$; $p<.01$), got pepper spray ($\chi^2(1)=7.24$; $p<.01$), installed caller ID or call blocking ($\chi^2(1)=6.29$; $p<.016$) and changed or installed new locks or security system ($\chi^2(1)=6.02$; $p<.016$). Those victims who were traditionally stalked were significantly less likely than those who were cyberstalked or stalked with technology to have taken time off from work or school ($\chi^2(1)=18.46$; $p<.001$), changed or quit a job or school ($\chi^2(1)=16.52$; $p<.001$), avoided family or friends ($\chi^2(1)=21.78$; $p<.001$), and changed their usual activities ($\chi^2(1)=18.21$; $p<.001$). And those who were traditionally stalked were significantly more likely than those who were cyberstalked or stalked with technology to have not changed their behaviors ($\chi^2(1)=12.75$; $p<.001$). Overall bivariate analyses revealed significant associations for the following protective actions taken by victims: took self-defense

classes, got a gun, and changed e-mail address ; however the minimum cell counts were not achieved and therefore the assumptions of the chi-square distribution were not met.

Help Sought by Victims

Victims of cyberstalking were significantly more likely than those who were stalked with technology or traditionally stalked to have enlisted the help of friends or family ($\chi^2(1)=8.86$; $p<.01$), asked people to not release information about them ($\chi^2(1)=23.84$; $p<.001$), talked to an attorney ($\chi^2(1)=7.76$; $p<.01$), and talked to a mental health professional ($\chi^2(1)=6.33$; $p<.016$). Victims who were stalked with technology were significantly more likely than those who were cyberstalked or traditionally stalked to have talked to an attorney ($\chi^2(1)=30.92$; $p<.001$), contacted victim services, shelter or help line ($\chi^2(1)=16.07$; $p<.001$), and talked to a doctor or nurse ($\chi^2(1)=24.20$; $p<.001$). Those who were traditionally stalked were significantly less likely than those who were cyberstalked or stalked with technology to have enlisted the help of friends or family ($\chi^2(1)=10.14$; $p<.01$), asked people to not release information about them ($\chi^2(1)=28.25$; $p<.001$), talked to an attorney ($\chi^2(1)=28.86$; $p<.001$), talked to a mental health professional ($\chi^2(1)=11.36$; $p<.01$), and talked to a doctor or nurse ($\chi^2(1)=20.84$; $p<.001$). And those who were traditionally stalked were significantly more likely than those who were cyberstalked or stalked with technology to have not sought help ($\chi^2(1)=6.68$; $p<.016$).

Consequences of Stalking Victimization

Victims who were stalked with technology were significantly more likely than those who were cyberstalked or traditionally stalked to have had moved in order to protect themselves from the

stalking behaviors ($\chi^2(1)=5.98$; $p<.016$) and to have lost time from work to change their phone number or move or fix damaged property ($\chi^2(1)=7.85$; $p<.01$). Overall bivariate analyses revealed significant associations for those victims who lost their job because of the stalking; however this did not follow the assumptions of the chi-square distribution as the cells had expected frequencies of 5 or less.

Table 17: Stalking Victims' Reactions to and Consequences of Victimization by Stalking Type

Variable	Cyberstalked (N=163)	Stalked with Technology (N=44)	Traditional (N=747)
Actions taken to protect victim[a]			
Took time off from work or school*	23.9	31.8	13.3
Changed or quit job or school*	14.7	18.2[b]	6.6
Changed route to work or school*	12.9	29.5	11.2
Avoided family/friends*	23.3	27.3	11.4
Changed usual activities*	29.4	38.6	17.8
Stayed with family/friends	17.8	25.0	16.6
Altered appearance	2.5[b]	6.8[b]	1.7
Took self-defense classes*	0.6[b]	6.8[b]	0.7[b]
Got pepper spray*	5.5[b]	15.9[b]	5.9
Got a gun*	4.3[b]	9.1[b]	2.4
Got another kind of weapon	1.2[b]	6.8[b]	2.0
Changed social security number	0.6[b]	----	0.1[b]
Changed e-mail address*	17.2	6.8[b]	3.5
Changed telephone number	22.1	13.6[b]	14.7
Installed caller ID/call blocking*	17.8	31.8	16.9
Changed or installed new locks or security system*	14.7	25.0	11.8
Did not change behaviors*	30.1	27.3	43.8
Help sought by victims[a]			
Enlisted help of friends/family*	51.5	47.7	38.4
Asked people not to release information*	47.9	43.2	27.4
Hired a private investigator	1.8[b]	4.5[b]	0.9[b]
Talked to an attorney*	27.6	52.3	16.1
Contact victim services/shelter/help line*	6.7	22.7	6.6
Obtained a restraining/protection/stay away order	12.9	15.9[b]	15.7
Talked to a mental health professional*	18.4	22.7	10.6
Talked to a doctor or nurse*	13.5	29.5	6.7
Talked to clergy/faith leader	11.7	15.9[b]	8.4
Talked to boss/employer*	30.7	34.1	18.9
Contacted building/office security	10.4	9.1[b]	9.0
Did not seek help*	25.8	15.9[b]	33.1
Reported to police	37.4	56.8	40.9

Variable	Cyberstalked (N=163)	Stalked with Technology (N=44)	Traditional (N=747)
Moved*	14.8	25.0	11.8
If moved, where to[a]			
A different house/apartment	62.5	27.3	55.7
A different city/state	45.8	81.8[b]	44.3
A shelter or safe house	4.2[b]	----	5.7[b]
Some other place	----	----	2.3[b]
Lost job*	1.2[b]	11.4[b]	3.4
Reason lost time from work			
Fear or concern for safety	16.9	27.6[b]	13.3
Getting a restraining/protection order or testifying in court	16.1	27.6[b]	12.8
Changing phone number/moving/fixing damaged property*	7.3[b]	20.7[b]	6.6

Sample size varies due to missing cases.
*Denotes significance at the bivariate level. [a] Multiple responses were allowed. [b] Based on less than 10 cases.

Examining Stalking Type by Victim-Offender Relationship

The next analyses examined stalking victimization split by type of stalking and victim-offender relationship. Specifically the type of stalking experienced was coded into six categories – cyberstalked by a current or former intimate partner (IP), cyberstalked by a non-intimate partner, stalked with technology (electronic monitoring) by a current or former intimate partner (IP), stalked with technology by a non-intimate partner, neither cyberstalked nor stalked with technology by a current or former intimate partner (IP), or neither cyberstalked nor stalked with technology by a non-intimate partner. These next analyses and all further analyses are completed for stalking victims only.

Victim Characteristics

Bivariate analyses were conducted to test the significance of association between the type of stalking by victim-offender relationship (intimate versus non-intimate) and the victim characteristics. The individual results for the frequencies of each of the variables across the six categories of stalking are not discussed within the test, but are presented in Table 18; and the relationships which are significant at the bivariate level are discussed below. The bivariate results are not shown separately, but those relationships that are significant are denoted with an asterisk (*) within the table. The test statistics and results for the bivariate analyses are discussed below. Since the stalking type is a six-category variable, a few adjustments were made in order to reduce the potential of error due to multiple analyses. Dummy variables were created in order to make comparisons of the groups of interest, that is, each dummy variable (3 total) is coded such that 1=IP stalking and 0=non-IP stalking (i.e. 1=IP cyberstalking, 0=non-IP cyberstalking and so forth). Therefore, each bivariate analysis was completed comparing those within each stalking type by victim-offender relationship (i.e. IP cyberstalking versus non-IP cyberstalking). In addition, a Bonferroni-type adjustment was used with an alpha level of .05 and six variables, as such, the new alpha level will be set at .008. These adjustments to the analysis will be applied for all further analyses examining stalking type by victim-offender relationship (Tables 18 through 21).

Gender

The majority of all victims, regardless of stalking type and victim-offender relationship, were female. No significant bivariate associations were found between type of stalking and victim-offender relationship and gender. The majority of offenders, regardless of stalking type

and victim-offender relationship were males. There were greater percentages of male offenders in the intimate partner categories among cyberstalking and traditional stalking.

Age

The mean age for those who were cyberstalked by an IP, cyberstalked by a non-IP, stalked with technology by an IP, stalked with technology by a non-IP, and traditionally stalked by an IP was about mid-30 years of age. The mean age for those who were traditionally stalked by a non-IP was 40.0. A t-test comparing the mean age of victims traditionally stalked by an IP to victims traditionally stalked by a non-IP revealed a significant difference ($t=5.18$, $p<.001$). Those who were traditionally stalked by an IP had a significantly lower mean age than those who were traditionally stalked by a non-IP.

Race and Ethnicity

The majority of all victims, regardless of stalking type and victim-offender relationship, were white. All of those who were stalked with technology were white. And the majority all victims were also of non-Hispanic origin. Those who were cyberstalked by a non-IP had the highest percentage of Hispanics (10.8%). No significant bivariate associations were found between type of stalking with victim-offender relationship and race or Hispanic origin.

Relationship Status

The modal relationship status category for those who were cyberstalked, stalked with technology, and traditionally stalked by an IP was divorced or separated. The modal relationship status category for those who were cyberstalked by a non-IP was never married. The modal relationship status category for those who were stalked with technology and traditionally stalked

by a non-IP was married. Significant bivariate associations were found between type of stalking with victim-offender relationship and relationship status, but the minimum cell counts were not achieved and therefore the assumptions of the chi-square distribution were not met and this test was not applicable.

Educational Attainment

The median education level for all victims, regardless of stalking type and victim-offender relationship, was some college. No significant bivariate associations were found between type of stalking with victim-offender relationship and education.

Income

The median income for those who were cyberstalked by an IP and a non-IP was $40,000-49,999. The median income for those who were stalked with technology by an IP, traditionally stalked by an IP, and traditionally stalked by a non-IP was $30,000-39,999. And the median income for those who were stalked with technology by a non-IP was $20,000-29,999. No significant bivariate associations were found between type of stalking with victim-offender relationship and household income.

Table 18: Examining Demographic Characteristics by Stalking Type and Victim-Offender Relationship

Variable	Cyber by IP (N=51)	Cyber by Non-IP (N=94)	Technology by IP (N=12)	Technology by Non-IP (N=26)	Traditional by IP (N=185)	Traditional by Non-IP (N=490)
Gender						
Female	68.6%	73.4%	75.0%[a]	65.4%	78.4%	78.0%
Mean Age (SD)*	34.7 (10.8)	36.0 (12.8)	38.5 (8.6)	38.1 (9.5)	34.4 (11.3)	40.0 (15.3)
Race						
White	82.4	89.4	100.0	92.3	85.9	83.5
Black	13.8	7.4[a]	----	----	9.7	10.4
American Indian/ Alaska Native	----	1.1[a]	----	----	1.1[a]	1.0[a]
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.0[a]	----	----	3.8[a]	0.5[a]	2.2
Multiracial	2.0[a]	2.1[a]	----	3.8[a]	2.7[a]	2.9
Hispanic Origin						
Hispanic	7.8[a]	10.8	8.3[a]	3.8[a]	8.2	9.2
Relationship status*						
Never married	36.0	48.4	25.0[a]	3.8[a]	36.6	33.7
Married	18.0	33.3	8.3[a]	50.0	14.8	41.7
Divorced or separated	46.0	17.2	66.7[a]	46.2	48.6	19.5
Widowed	----	1.1[a]	----	----	----	5.1
Education*						
Less than high school	11.8[a]	3.2[a]	25.0[a]	3.8[a]	11.6	13.1
High school	15.7[a]	20.2	33.3[a]	42.3	29.8	29.3
Some college	31.4	29.8	33.3[a]	19.2[a]	30.9	26.8
Associate degree	7.8[a]	16.0	----	15.4[a]	8.8	7.4
Bachelor degree	21.6	23.4	8.3[a]	15.4[a]	13.3	14.8
Graduate/prof degree	11.8[a]	7.4[a]	----	3.8[a]	5.5	8.6
Household income*						
Less than $10,000	4.7[a]	6.0[a]	----	8.7[a]	14.5	14.4
$10,000-19,999	16.3[a]	12.0[a]	42.9[a]	21.7[a]	22.0	16.1
$20,000-29,999	4.7[a]	9.6[a]	----	21.7[a]	13.2	13.3
$30,000-39,999	11.6[a]	10.8[a]	28.6[a]	4.3[a]	13.2	11.9
$40,000-49,999	14.0[a]	16.9	----	17.4[a]	4.4[a]	11.0
$50,000-74,999	32.6	19.3	14.3[a]	13.0[a]	17.0	14.7
$75,000 or more	16.3[a]	25.3	14.3[a]	13.0[a]	15.7	18.6

Sample size varies due to missing cases.
*Denotes significance at the bivariate level. [a] Based on less than 10 cases.

Nature of Stalking by Stalking Type and Victim-Offender Relationship

Bivariate analyses were conducted to test the significance of association between the type of stalking by victim-offender relationship (IP versus non-IP) and the nature of stalking. The individual results for the frequencies of each of the variables across the six categories of stalking are not discussed within the test, but are presented in Table 19; and the relationships which are significant at the bivariate level are discussed below. The bivariate results are not shown separately, but those relationships that are significant are denoted with an asterisk (*) within the table. The test statistics and results for the bivariate analyses are discussed below.

Stalking Behaviors Experienced by Victims

Those who were traditionally stalked by an IP were significantly more likely than those traditionally stalked by a non-IP to have experienced unwanted phone calls or messages ($\chi^2(1)=18.06$; $p<.001$) and unwanted letters, e-mails, or other written communication ($\chi^2(1)=9.17$, $p<.008$). Also, those who were traditionally stalked by an IP were significantly more likely than those traditionally stalked by a non-IP to have experienced their stalker following or spying on them ($\chi^2(1)=18.90$, $p<.001$) and showing up at places where he/she had no business being ($\chi^2(1)=26.17$, $p<.001$).

Other Crimes Perpetrated Against Victims or Other Persons

Bivariate analyses were completed examining the association of the type of stalking with victim-offender relationship and the other crimes perpetrated against victims or other persons. Significant associations were found among property crimes and the type of stalking with victim-offender relationship. Those who were traditionally stalked by an IP were significantly more

likely than those traditionally stalked by a non-IP to have had their stalker illegally enter their house/apartment ($\chi^2(1)=9.54$, $p<.008$), illegally enter their car ($\chi^2(1)=19.67$, $p<.001$), and damage or destroy their property ($\chi^2(1)=13.79$, $p<.001$). Other significant associations were found among identity theft crimes and the type of stalking (specifically traditional stalking) with victim-offender relationship; however, the expected frequencies were less than 5 and therefore the assumptions of the chi-square distribution were not met and this test was not applicable. Even though some associations were not significant, which is likely because of the low respondent count in various categories; it does appear that across the board those who were stalked by an IP were more likely to have experienced property or identity theft crimes.

Those who were cyberstalked by an IP were more likely than those cyberstalked by a non-IP to have been hit, slapped, or knocked down, and these differences were significant; however, the minimum cell counts were not achieved and therefore the assumptions of the chi-square distribution were not met and this test was no longer precise. Those who were traditionally stalked by an IP were significantly more likely than those who were traditionally stalked by a non-IP to have been hit, slapped, or knocked down, ($\chi^2(1)=29.34$, $p<.001$), choked or strangled ($\chi^2(1)=19.82$, $p<.001$), attacked with a weapon ($\chi^2(1)=16.04$, $p<.001$), and chased or dragged by a car ($\chi^2(1)=11.25$, $p<.008$). There was also a significant difference found among those who were traditionally stalked by an IP and non-IP and were raped or sexually assaulted; however, the expected frequencies were less than 5 and therefore the assumptions of the chi-square distribution were not met. Again it does appear that those who are stalked by a current or former IP, regardless of how they are stalked, are more likely to have experienced an attack.

Those who were traditionally stalked by a non-IP were significantly more likely than those traditionally stalked by an IP to have not sustained any physical injuries in attacks ($\chi^2(1)=9.15$, $p<.008$). Those who were traditionally stalked by an IP were significantly more likely than those traditionally stalked by a non-IP to have sustained bruises, black eyes, cuts, scratches, swelling, or chipped teeth as a result of their attacks ($\chi^2(1)=13.65$, $p<.001$). No significant associations were found among attacks against other persons/pets or weapons used in the attacks and the type of stalking with victim-offender relationship.

Threats Made Against Victims

Further analyses were completed to examine associations between threats made against the victim and the type of stalking with victim-offender relationship. Victims who were traditionally stalked by an IP were significantly more likely than those who were traditionally stalked by a non-IP to have received threats of being killed ($\chi^2(1)=13.01$, $p<.001$), harm to their child ($\chi^2(1)=18.47$, $p<.001$), and the offender harming or killing him/herself ($\chi^2(1)=27.91$, $p<.001$).

Onset, Duration, and Frequency of Stalking

A t-test found a significant difference in the mean years of stalking occurrence among those who were traditionally stalked by an IP compared to those who were traditionally stalked by a non-IP ($t=-2.94$; $p<.004$). Those who were traditionally stalked by an IP were significantly more likely than those who were traditionally stalked by a non-IP to have experienced stalking for a longer duration of time. No significant differences were found in the mean frequency of stalking among the stalking type by victim-offender relationship. And no significant differences

were found among stalking types by victim-offender relationship with regard to whether the stalking was still occurring.

Table 19: Characteristics of Stalking Behaviors Experienced by Cyberstalking and Victim-Offender Relationship

Variable	Cyber by IP (N=51)	Cyber by Non-IP (N=94)	Technology by IP (N=12)	Technology by Non-IP (N=26)	Traditional by IP (N=185)	Traditional by Non-IP (N=490)
Stalking Behaviors Experienced by Victims[a]						
Unwanted phone calls and messages	82.4%	69.1%	58.3%[b]	57.7%	81.1%	64.1%*
Unwanted letters, e-mails, or other written communication	68.6	71.3	33.3[b]	26.9[b]	32.4	21.2*
Following or spying	47.1	38.3	83.3	46.2	48.1	30.2*
Waiting for victim at various places	33.3	29.8	50.0[b]	50.0	37.3	28.8
Showing up a places	47.1	27.7	75.0[b]	69.2	48.1	27.3*
Leaving unwanted items, presents, or flowers	25.5	18.1	25.0[b]	7.7[b]	17.8	11.4
Posting information or spreading rumors	49.0	53.2	50.0[b]	57.7	41.6	33.7
Other crimes perpetrated against victim[a]						
Property Crimes						
Illegally entered house/apartment	13.7[b]	7.5[b]	41.7[b]	19.2[b]	20.0	10.9*
Illegally entered car	15.7[b]	4.3[b]	16.7[b]	4.2[b]	11.5	2.9*
Damaged or destroyed property	29.4	11.8	33.3[b]	26.9[b]	21.2	10.3*
Identity Theft						
Charged items to credit card	----	----	----	----	6.6	0.8[b]*
Opened/closed accounts	14.0[b]	4.3[b]	8.3[b]	4.0[b]	4.4[b]	0.8[b]*
Took money from accounts	8.3[b]	2.2[b]	16.7[b]	----	5.5	1.7[b]*
Attack or attempt to attack[a]						
A child	----	4.3[b]	8.3[b]	7.7[b]	5.9	3.5
Another family member	----	7.4[b]	8.3[b]	11.5[b]	5.4	6.6
A friend or co-worker	3.9[b]	8.6[b]	16.7[b]	7.7[b]	4.3[b]	4.5
A pet	3.9[b]	1.1[b]	8.3[b]	7.7[b]	4.9[b]	3.7

Variable	Cyber by IP (N=51)	Cyber by Non-IP (N=94)	Technology by IP (N=12)	Technology by Non-IP (N=26)	Traditional by IP (N=185)	Traditional by Non-IP (N=490)
Attacked or attempted to attack victim[a]						
Hit, slapped, or knocked down	27.5	4.3[b]*	16.7[b]	8.0[b]	22.5	7.5*
Choked or strangled	5.9[b]	1.1[b]	16.7[b]	4.0[b]	8.9	1.7[b]*
Raped or sexually assaulted	3.9[b]	1.1[b]	8.3[b]	----	3.3[b]	0.6[b]*
Attacked with a weapon	2.0[b]	1.1[b]	25.0[b]	8.0[b]	8.8	2.1*
Chased or dragged with a car	8.0[b]	2.2[b]	8.3[b]	4.0[b]	6.7	1.7[b]*
Attacked in some other way	8.0[b]	8.6[b]	9.1[b]	15.4[b]	8.2	6.0
Weapon used in attack[a,c]						
Gun	----	----	33.3[b]	50.1[b]	25.0[b]	20.0[b]
Knife or other sharp object	100.0[b]	----	33.3[b]	50.1[b]	50.0[b]	20.0[b]
Blunt or other object	----	----	33.3[b]	----	25.0[b]	60.0[b]
Physical injuries sustained in attack[a,d]						
None	46.7[b]	50.0[b]	25.0[b]	----	29.8	61.4*
Raped	6.7[b]	----	----	----	6.4[b]	2.3[b]
Attempted rape	----	----	----	----	2.1[b]	2.3[b]
Sexual assault	13.3[b]	----	----	----	2.1[b]	----
Knife or stab wounds	6.7[b]	----	----	50.0[b]	2.1[b]	----
Gunshot, bullet wounds	----	----	----	----	----	----
Broken bones or teeth knocked out	----	----	----	----	8.5[b]	2.3[b]
Internal injuries	----	----	----	----	2.1[b]	2.3[b]
Knocked unconscious	----	----	----	50.0[b]	4.3[b]	----
Bruises, black eye, cuts, scratches, swelling, chipped teeth	46.7[b]	33.3[b]	75.0[b]	50.0[b]	66.0	27.3*
Other	----	16.7[b]	----	----	6.4[b]	9.1[b]

Variable	Cyber by IP (N=51)	Cyber by Non-IP (N=94)	Technology by IP (N=12)	Technology by Non-IP (N=26)	Traditional by IP (N=185)	Traditional by Non-IP (N=490)
Threats made against victims[a]						
Kill victim	8.2[b]	11.5	25.0[b]	25.0[b]	20.2	9.7*
Rape or sexually assault victim	2.1[b]	1.2[b]	18.2[b]	----	2.9[b]	1.1[b]
Harm victim with a weapon	6.4[b]	8.1[b]	27.3[b]	13.6[b]	10.2	5.4
Hit, slap, or harm victim in some other way	14.9[b]	13.1	45.5[b]	25.0[b]	17.6	12.7
Harm or kidnap a child	4.2[b]	3.6[b]	9.1[b]	4.5[b]	12.1	3.3*
Harm another family member	2.1[b]	8.0[b]	18.2[b]	9.1[b]	5.2[b]	6.9
Harm a friend or co-worker	4.3[b]	8.3[b]	18.2[b]	9.1[b]	6.9	2.6
Harm a pet	2.1[b]	1.2[b]	18.2[b]	4.5[b]	2.9[b]	2.8
Harm or kill (himself/herself)	16.7[b]	8.2[b]	18.2[b]	4.5[b]	19.0	5.4*
Threaten victim in some other way	25.0[b]	20.0[b]	33.3[b]	31.8[b]	16.3	13.9
Onset/duration of stalking						
Less than one year	56.0	52.7	18.2[b]	34.6[b]	39.0	61.9
One to five years	36.0	41.9	63.6[b]	61.5	45.1	30.8
More than five years	8.0[b]	5.4[b]	18.2[b]	3.8[b]	15.9	7.3
Frequency of stalking						
Once or twice a year	2.0[b]	10.8	----	3.8[b]	11.0	15.4
Once or twice a month	24.0	11.8	----	19.2[b]	18.1	17.0
Once or twice a week	32.0	21.5	33.3[b]	23.1[b]	25.8	18.9
Almost every day	22.0	17.2	41.7[b]	7.7[b]	14.8	16.0
At least once a day	2.0[b]	6.5[b]	----	19.2[b]	6.0	6.0
No set pattern	18.0[b]	32.3[b]	25.0[b]	26.9[b]	24.2	26.6
Stalking behaviors still occurring	46.0	26.9	54.5[b]	58.3[b]	42.4	32.9

Sample size varies due to missing cases. *Denotes significance at the bivariate level. [a] Multiple responses were allowed. [b] Based on less than 10 cases. [c] Only asked of those victims who were attacked with a weapon (N=36). [d] Only asked of those victims who were attacked physically, not with a car or in "some other way" (N=131).

Victims' Responses to Stalking by Type of Stalking and Victim-Offender Relationship

Bivariate analyses were conducted to test the significance of association between the type of stalking by victim-offender relationship and victims' responses to stalking. The individual results for the frequencies of each of the variables across the six categories of stalking are not discussed within the test, but are presented in Table 20; and the relationships which are significant at the bivariate level are discussed below. The bivariate results are not shown separately, but those relationships that are significant are denoted with an asterisk (*) within the table. The test statistics and results for the bivariate analyses are discussed below.

Why Victim Thought Perpetrator Began Stalking

Victims who were cyberstalked by an IP were significantly more likely than victims who were cyberstalked by a non-IP to believe that the stalking started to keep them in the relationship with the offender ($\chi^2(1)=35.76$, $p<.001$). Victims who were traditionally stalked by an IP were significantly more likely than victims who were traditionally stalked by a non-IP to have believed that the stalking started because the offender wanted to catch them doing something ($\chi^2(1)=21.44$, $p<.001$), control them ($\chi^2(1)=116.14$, $p<.001$), keep them in the relationship with the offender ($\chi^2(1)=247.30$, $p<.001$), or that the offender was a substance abuser ($\chi^2(1)=10.49$, $p<.008$) or mentally ill or emotionally unstable ($\chi^2(1)=11.98$, $p<.008$). Those who were traditionally stalked by a non-IP were significantly more likely than those traditionally stalked by an IP to not know why the stalking started ($\chi^2(1)=13.29$, $p<.001$). Even though some associations were not significant most likely because of the small number of respondents in each

individual category, the pattern does appear that those who were stalked by an IP felt the offender stalked them to control them or keep them in the relationship.

How Victim Felt

Bivariate analyses were first completed for associations between how victims felt when the behaviors first began and the type of stalking with victim-offender relationship. Victims who were traditionally stalked by an IP were more likely than victims who were traditionally stalked by a non-IP to have reported that they felt frightened ($\chi^2(1)=6.98$; $p<.008$), depressed ($\chi^2(1)=14.24$, $p<.001$), and sick ($\chi^2(1)=18.80$, $p<.001$). Significant associations were also found when victims who were traditionally stalked said they felt suicidal, but the minimum cell counts were not achieved and therefore the assumptions of the chi-square distribution were not met.

Analyses were then completed to examine how the victims felt when the stalking progressed. Those who were traditionally stalked by an IP were significantly more likely than those who were traditionally stalked by a non-IP to have reported that they felt helpless ($\chi^2(1)=8.64$, $p<.008$) as the behaviors progressed.

Victims' Worst Fears

Victims who were traditionally stalked by an IP were significantly more likely than victims who were traditionally stalked by a non-IP to have reported that their worst fear was death ($\chi^2(1)=11.05$, $p<.008$), harm to their child ($\chi^2(1)=7.42$, $p<.008$), and loss of freedom ($\chi^2(1)=7.89$, $p<.008$).

Victims' Definition of the Behaviors

No significant bivariate relationships were found among stalking type by victim-offender relationship and whether or not the unwanted behaviors were defined as stalking.

Table 20: Stalking Victims' Responses to Victimization by Cyberstalking and Victim-Offender Relationship

Variable	Cyber by IP (N=51)	Cyber by Non-IP (N=94)	Technology by IP (N=12)	Technology by Non-IP (N=26)	Traditional by IP (N=185)	Traditional by Non-IP (N=490)
Why perpetrator started stalking[a]						
For retaliation/ anger/spite	43.1%	31.9%	50.0%[b]	46.2%	41.1%	34.6%
Catch victim doing something	13.7[b]	3.2[b]	16.7[b]	7.7[b]	9.2	1.6[b]*
Control victim	56.9	38.3	83.3[b]	38.5	61.1	18.4*
Keep victim in relationship	49.0	6.4[b]*	33.3[b]	----	52.4	2.5*
Thought I liked the attention	3.9[b]	5.3[b]	----	3.8[b]	0.5[b]	3.1
Substance abuser	9.8[b]	7.4[b]	8.3[b]	11.5[b]	24.9	14.3*
Mentally ill/emotionally unstable	29.4	23.4	25.0[b]	26.9[b]	35.1	22.1*
Perpetrator liked attention	11.8[b]	8.5[b]	8.3[b]	7.7[b]	10.3	8.6
Liked victim/found victim attractive/had crush on victim	25.5	27.7	8.3[b]	7.7[b]	16.8	14.7
Different cultural beliefs/background	7.8[b]	3.2[b]	16.7[b]	7.7[b]	2.7[b]	3.3
Proximity/ convenience/ victim was alone	7.8[b]	4.3[b]	16.7[b]	7.7[b]	6.5	7.4
Other	9.8[b]	18.1	8.3[b]	26.9[b]	10.8	23.1*
Don’t know	5.9[b]	6.4[b]	----	7.7[b]	2.7[b]	11.9*
How victim felt when stalking began[a]						
Anxious/concerned	52.9	56.4	75.0[b]	50.0	49.2	51.9
Annoyed/angry	76.5	75.5	66.7[b]	84.6	65.4	67.3
Frightened	49.0	35.1	41.7[b]	34.6[b]	52.4	41.4*
Depressed	23.5	13.8	16.7[b]	11.5[b]	23.8	12.1*
Helpless	29.4	19.1	41.7[b]	46.2	26.5	18.6
Sick	21.6	12.8	8.3[b]	23.1[b]	24.9	11.5*
Suicidal	2.0[b]	2.1[b]	----	3.8[b]	3.2[b]	0.6[b]*
Some other way	7.8[b]	10.6	8.3[b]	3.8[b]	9.7	6.3

Variable	Cyber by IP (N=51)	Cyber by Non-IP (N=94)	Technology by IP (N=12)	Technology by Non-IP (N=26)	Traditional by IP (N=185)	Traditional by Non-IP (N=490)
How victim felt when stalking progressed[a]						
No change in feelings	27.5	26.9	25.0[b]	26.9[b]	33.0	32.4
Anxious/concerned	31.4	25.8	41.7[b]	26.7[b]	18.4	25.0
Annoyed/angry	45.1	53.8	33.3[b]	57.7[b]	42.2	42.8
Frightened	17.6[b]	26.9	41.7[b]	38.5	27.0	23.6
Depressed	15.7[b]	7.5[b]	33.3[b]	11.5[b]	11.4	5.5
Helpless	17.6[b]	15.1	33.3[b]	34.6[b]	17.3	9.3*
Sick	11.8[b]	7.5[b]	8.3[b]	15.4[b]	9.2	6.1
Suicidal	2.0[b]	1.1[b]	----	----	0.5[b]	0.4[b]
Some other way	11.8[b]	10.8	8.3[b]	7.7[b]	7.0	6.4
Victims' worst fears[a]						
Death	7.8[b]	6.4[b]	25.0[b]	11.5[b]	14.7	6.5*
Physical/bodily harm	27.5	23.4	41.7[b]	42.3	35.9	29.7
Harm or kidnap child	21.6	11.7	8.3[b]	19.2[b]	19.0	11.0*
Harm current partner	5.9[b]	10.6	8.3[b]	3.8[b]	6.0	5.9
Harm other family members	7.8[b]	10.6	25.0[b]	15.4[b]	7.6	14.5
Loss of job	7.8[b]	9.6[b]	----	15.4[b]	4.3[b]	5.7
Loss of freedom	11.8[b]	11.7	8.3[b]	15.4[b]	14.1	7.2*
Behavior would never stop	27.5	34.0	50.0[b]	34.6[b]	29.9	27.2
Not knowing what might happen next	51.0	57.4	50.0[b]	57.7[b]	37.5	48.1
Lose mind	5.9[b]	2.1[b]	25.0[b]	7.7[b]	4.3[b]	3.7
Other	17.6[b]	18.1	16.7[b]	7.7[b]	12.5	17.6
Don't know	7.8[b]	3.2[b]	8.3[b]	3.8[b]	4.3[b]	5.5
Victim defined behaviors as stalking	66.7	66.7	91.7	72.0	44.1	54.8

Sample size varies due to missing cases. *Denotes significance at the bivariate level. [a] Multiple responses were allowed. [b] Based on less than 10 cases

Stalking Victims' Reactions and Consequences of Victimization by Stalking Type and Victim-Offender Relationship

Bivariate analyses were conducted to test the significance of associations between the type of stalking by victim-offender relationship and the victims' reactions to and consequences of stalking. The individual results for the frequencies of each of the variables across the six categories of stalking are not discussed within the test, but are presented in Table 21; and the relationships which are significant at the bivariate level are discussed below. The bivariate results are not shown separately, but those relationships that are significant are denoted with an asterisk (*) within the table. The test statistics and results for the bivariate analyses are discussed below.

Actions Taken by Victim for Protection

Victims who were traditionally stalked by an IP were significantly more likely than victims traditionally stalked by a non-IP to have taken time off from work or school ($\chi^2(1)=12.59$, $p<.001$), changed or quit job or school ($\chi^2(1)=18.60$, $p<.001$), changed their route to work or school ($\chi^2(1)=23.60$, $p<.001$), avoided family or friends ($\chi^2(1)=8.74$, $p<.008$), changed their usual activities ($\chi^2(1)=8.41$, $p<.008$), stayed with family or friends ($\chi^2(1)=60.63$, $p<.001$), got pepper spray ($\chi^2(1)=7.87$, $p<.008$), changed their e-mail address ($\chi^2(1)=21.27$, $p<.001$), changed their telephone number ($\chi^2(1)=19.75$, $p<.001$), installed caller ID or call blocking ($\chi^2(1)=9.56$, $p<.008$), and changed or installed new locks or security system ($\chi^2(1)=15.45$, $p<.001$). Those who were traditionally stalked by a non-IP were significantly more likely than those traditionally stalked by an IP to have not take any action to protect

themselves ($\chi^2(1)=36.60$, $p<.001$). Overall, those who were traditionally stalked by a current or former IP appear to have taken more protective action.

Help Sought by Victims

Victims who were cyberstalked by an IP were significantly more likely than victims who were cyberstalked by a non-IP to have talked to an attorney ($\chi^2(1)=9.52$; $p<.008$). Victim of IP cyberstalking obtained a restraining, protection, or stay away order more often than victims of non-IP cyberstalking, but the minimum cell counts were not achieved and therefore the assumptions of the chi-square distribution were not met and this test was no longer accurate. Victims who were cyberstalked by a non-IP were significantly more likely than victims who were cyberstalked by a non-IP to have not sought help ($\chi^2(1)=7.19$, $p<.008$). Victims who were traditionally stalked by an IP were significantly more likely than victims cyberstalked by a non-IP to have enlisted the help of friends or family ($\chi^2(1)=9.89$; $p<.008$), asked people to not release information about them ($\chi^2(1)=28.71$; $p<.001$), talked to an attorney ($\chi^2(1)=40.55$; $p<.001$), contacted victim services, a shelter, or help line ($\chi^2(1)=29.86$; $p<.001$), obtained a restraining, protection, or stay away order ($\chi^2(1)=41.97$; $p<.001$), talked to a mental health professional ($\chi^2(1)=13.63$; $p<.001$), talked to a doctor or nurse ($\chi^2(1)=10.34$; $p<.008$), and talked to a clergy or faith leader ($\chi^2(1)=7.80$; $p<.008$). And those who were traditionally stalked by a non-IP were significantly more likely than those who were traditionally stalked by an IP to have not sought help ($\chi^2(1)=18.84$; $p<.001$). Overall, those who were stalked by a current or former IP appear to have sought out help more often.

Consequences of Stalking Victimization

Victims who were cyberstalked by an IP were significantly more likely than those cyberstalked by a non-IP to have lost time from work because they had to get a restraining or protection order or testify in court ($\chi^2(1)=11.29$; $p<.008$). Victims who were traditionally stalked by an IP were significantly more likely than those traditionally stalked by a non-IP to have moved because of the victimization ($\chi^2(1)=62.61$; $p<.001$). Victims who were traditionally stalked by an IP were significantly more likely than those traditionally stalked by a non-IP to have lost time from work due to fear or concern for their safety ($\chi^2(1)=12.41$; $p<.001$), because they had to get a restraining or protection order or testify in court ($\chi^2(1)=15.09$; $p<.001$), and because they had to change their phone number, move, or fix damaged property ($\chi^2(1)=22.10$; $p<.001$).

Table 21: Stalking Victims' Reactions to and Consequences of Victimization by Cyberstalking and Victim-Offender Relationship

Variable	Cyber by IP (N=51)	Cyber by Non-IP (N=94)	Technology by IP (N=12)	Technology by Non-IP (N=26)	Traditional by IP (N=185)	Traditional by Non-IP (N=490)
Actions taken to protect victim[a]						
Took time off from work or school	33.3%	18.1%	41.7%[b]	30.8%[b]	21.6%	11.0%*
Changed or quit job or school	17.6[b]	13.8	16.7[b]	15.4[b]	14.1	4.5*
Changed route to work or school	15.7[b]	8.5[b]	33.3[b]	30.8[b]	21.1	7.8*
Avoided family/friends	27.5	19.1	50.0[b]	11.5[b]	18.4	10.0*
Changed usual activities	41.2	21.3	66.7[b]	30.8	25.7	15.7*
Stayed with family/friends	27.5	12.8	33.3[b]	23.1[b]	36.2	10.6*
Altered appearance	2.0[b]	3.2[b]	16.7[b]	----	3.2[b]	1.2[b]
Took self-defense classes	----	1.1[b]	25.0[b]	----*	1.6[b]	0.4[b]
Got pepper spray	2.0[b]	6.4[b]	16.7[b]	15.4[b]	10.3	4.5*
Got a gun	----	5.3[b]	8.3[b]	11.5[b]	3.8[b]	2.0
Got another kind of weapon	----	2.1[b]	8.3[b]	----	3.2[b]	1.6[b]
Changed social security number	2.0[b]	----	----	----	0.5[b]	----
Changed e-mail address	17.6[b]	17.0	16.7[b]	3.8[b]	8.6	1.4[b]*
Changed telephone number	31.4	18.1	16.7[b]	11.5[b]	24.3	10.8*
Installed caller ID/call blocking	15.7[b]	20.2	41.7[b]	30.8[b]	24.3	14.3*
Changed or installed new locks or security system	25.5	9.6[b]	25.0[b]	26.9[b]	20.0	9.0*
Did not change behaviors	29.4	30.9	25.0[b]	23.1[b]	23.8	49.6*
Help sought by victims[a]						
Enlisted help of friends/family	60.8	45.7	66.7[b]	46.2	49.2	35.9*
Asked people not to release information	52.9	46.8	58.3[b]	42.3[b]	43.2	22.4*
Hired a private investigator	2.0[b]	1.1[b]	16.7[b]	----	1.1[b]	1.0[b]
Talked to an attorney	43.1	19.1*	58.3[b]	57.7	32.4	11.6*
Contact victim services/ shelter/help line	9.8[b]	4.3[b]	33.3[b]	15.4[b]	15.7	3.7*
Obtained a restraining/ protection/stay away order	25.5	3.2[b]*	33.3[b]	11.5[b]	31.9	11.0*
Talked to a mental health professional	29.4	14.9	33.3[b]	15.4[b]	18.4	8.4*

Variable	Cyber by IP (N=51)	Cyber by Non-IP (N=94)	Technology by IP (N=12)	Technology by Non-IP (N=26)	Traditional by IP (N=185)	Traditional by Non-IP (N=490)
Talked to a doctor or nurse	23.5	9.6[b]	50.0[b]	23.1[b]	11.9	4.9*
Talked to clergy/faith leader	13.7[b]	8.5[b]	16.7[b]	15.4[b]	14.1	7.1*
Talked to boss/employer	39.2	27.7	25.0[b]	38.5	22.2	18.2
Contacted building/office security	11.8[b]	9.6[b]	8.3[b]	7.7[b]	10.3	9.6
Did not seek help	11.8[b]	31.9*	16.7[b]	11.5[b]	18.9	36.3*
Reported to police	45.1	34.0	66.7[b]	53.8	48.4	40.6
Moved	27.5	10.8	16.7[b]	23.1[b]	28.1	5.9*
If moved, where to[a]						
A different house/ apartment	57.1[b]	70.0[b]	50.0[b]	33.3[b]	53.8	58.6
A different city/state	50.0[b]	40.0[b]	50.0[b]	83.3[b]	46.2	41.4
A shelter or safe house	7.1[b]	----	----	----	7.7[b]	3.4[b]
Some other place	----	----	----	----	1.9[b]	3.4[b]
Lost job	----	2.1[b]	16.7[b]	11.5[b]	5.5	2.1
Reason lost time from work						
Fear or concern for safety	16.3[b]	16.7	37.5[b]	22.2[b]	23.1	10.4*
Getting a restraining/protection order or testifying in court	32.6	7.6[b]*	37.5[b]	22.2[b]	23.1	9.4*
Changing phone number/ moving/fixing damaged property	7.0[b]	6.1[b]	25.0[b]	16.7[b]	15.7	3.2*

Sample size varies due to missing cases. *Denotes significance at the bivariate level. [a] Multiple responses were allowed. [b] Based on less than 10 cases.

CHAPTER FIVE: COMPARING INTIMATE PARTNER STALKING AND NONINTIMATE PARTNER STALKING

The previous analyses have shown that the major differences in stalking victimization lie between those victimized by intimate partners and those victimized by others or nonintimate partners. The next step in the analysis was to examine in more detail the differences between intimate and nonintimate partner perpetrated stalking. Analyses were completed examining the nature of stalking, severity of stalking, victim responses, victims' reactions, and consequences of victimization. And to be consistent with all previous analyses, the following analyses were only completed on victims of stalking.

Nature of Stalking by Intimate and Nonintimate Stalking

Bivariate analyses were conducted to test the significance of association between victim-offender relationship (intimate versus nonintimate) and the nature of the stalking incidents. The results of the bivariate analyses are presented in Table 22. The various variables which make up the overall aspects of the nature of stalking were assessed and combined for data reduction and analysis purposes. These recodes are discussed below.

Stalking Behaviors Experienced by Intimate and Nonintimate Stalking Victims

The seven stalking behaviors which victims experienced were combined so each of the behaviors each victim experienced were counted to make one total scale variable with a range of 1 to 7. A t-test was conducted comparing the mean scores on this stalking behavior scale of intimate partner stalking victims to nonintimate partner stalking victims. A significant difference

emerged (t=-6.38, p<.001). Victims of intimate partner stalking experience significantly more types of stalking behaviors than those who are victims of nonintimate partner stalking.

Other Crimes Perpetrated Against Victims or Other Persons by Intimate and Nonintimate Partners

The sixteen other crimes that were perpetrated against victims in conjunction with the stalking variables (including property, identity theft, attacks on others, and attacks on victims) were combined by counting the number of crimes each victim experienced to make one total scale variable with a range of 0 to 11. In addition, separate scales were also made using a count for property crimes (three variables, range 0 to 3), identity theft (three variables, range 0 to 3), attack or attempted attack on others (four variables, range 0 to 4), and attack or attempted attack on victims (six variables, range 0 to 6).

Multiple t-tests were conducted comparing the mean total number of crimes, property crimes, and identity theft crimes perpetrated against victims of both intimate and nonintimate stalking. Those who were victims of intimate partner stalking had experienced significantly more crimes in conjunction with their stalking victimization than those who were victims of nonintimate partner stalking (t=-6.40, p<.001). Victims of intimate partner stalking experienced significantly more property crimes in conjunction with their stalking victimization than victims of nonintimate partner stalking (t=-5.37, p<.001). Victims of intimate partner stalking experienced significantly more identity theft in conjunction with their stalking victimization than victims of nonintimate partner stalking (t=-4.40, p<.001).

T-tests were completed comparing the mean number of attacks on others and on victims for victims of intimate and nonintimate stalking. No significant difference was found between

victims of intimate and nonintimate partner stalking and the number of attacks on others that were committed in conjunction with their stalking victimization. Victims of intimate partner stalking experienced significantly more attacks or attempted attacks in conjunction with their stalking victimization than victims of nonintimate partner stalking ($t=-5.37$, $p<.001$).

Nature of Attack or Attempted Attack on Victims by Intimate and Nonintimate Partners

No significant difference was found among the type of weapon used in attacks with weapons on victims among victims of intimate and nonintimate partner stalking. Although it does appear that intimate partner perpetrators were more likely to use a knife or other sharp object. Physical injuries sustained in an attack were recoded to a single variable were 0=no physical injury and 1=physical injury. Victims of intimate partner stalking were significantly more likely than victims of nonintimate partner stalking to have sustained injuries in attacks committed against them in conjunction with their stalking victimization ($\chi^2(1)=7.06$; $p<.01$).

Threats Made against Victims by Intimate and Nonintimate Partners

The ten threats offenders made against the victim were combined to make one total scale variable with a range of 0 to 10. In addition, threats against the victim (kill, rape or sexually assault, harm with a weapon, hit/slap/harm, other way) and threats against others (harm/kidnap child, harm another family member, harm friend or co-worker, harm pet) were counted to make two additional composite variables (range of 0 to 5 and 0 to 4, respectively). The decision was made to analyze the threat by the offender to harm or kill him/herself separately as it is neither a direct threat against the victim or someone else.

T-tests were conducted comparing the mean total number of threats, threats against others, and threats against the victims. Victims of intimate partner stalking experienced significantly more threats overall than victims of nonintimate partner stalking ($t=-4.28$, $p<.001$). Victims of intimate partner stalking also experienced significantly more threats against others than victims of nonintimate partner stalking ($t=-2.15$, $p<.05$). Victims of intimate partner stalking experienced significantly more direct threats against themselves than victims of nonintimate partner stalking ($t=-3.45$, $p<.001$). In addition, victims of intimate partner stalking also experienced significantly more threats by the offender to harm or kill him/herself than victims of nonintimate partner stalking ($\chi^2(1)=35.14$; $p<.001$).

Onset, Duration, and Frequency of Stalking

As in previous analysis, the onset/duration of stalking was measured by asking the victim how long ago they realized the behaviors were occurring, which was then coded into years to measure the duration of the stalking behaviors. A t-test was conducted comparing the duration mean scores of victims of intimate partner stalking to victims of nonintimate partner stalking, and a significant difference was found ($t=-3.08$, $p<.01$). Victims of intimate partner stalking have experienced the stalking for a significantly longer duration than victims of nonintimate partner stalking.

And as before, the frequency of stalking is how often the stalking behaviors occurred with the variable ranging from (1) once or twice a year to (5) at least once a day. No significant difference was found on the frequency of stalking experienced by victims of intimate and nonintimate stalking.

Chi square analysis was completed looking at whether or not victims of intimate and nonintimate partner reported that the unwanted behaviors were still occurring. Those victims who were stalked by an intimate partner were significantly more likely than those stalked by a nonintimate partner to have reported the unwanted behaviors were still ongoing ($\chi^2(1)=10.25$; $p<.01$).

Table 22: Bivariate Test Statistics for Stalking Characteristics by Intimate and Nonintimate Stalking

Variable	Intimate Partner Stalking (N=256)		Nonintimate Partner Stalking (N=623)		Test Statistic *t* or χ^2
	Mean	%	Mean	%	
Stalking behaviors experienced by victims	3.22		2.38		-6.38***
Total other crimes perpetrated against victim	1.59		0.72		-6.40***
Property crimes	0.58		0.26		-5.37***
Identity theft	0.20		0.04		-4.40***
Attack or attempted attack on others	0.20		0.21		0.26
Attack or attempted attack on victim	0.62		0.21		-6.08***
Weapon used in attack[a,b]					3.77
Gun		23.8[c]		28.6[c]	
Knife or other sharp object		52.4		21.4[c]	
Blunt or other object		23.8[c]		50.0[c]	
Physical injuries sustained in attack[d]		68.1		44.4	7.06**
Threats made against victims (total)	1.11		0.65		-4.28***
Threats against others	0.25		0.16		-2.15*
Threats against victim	0.66		0.44		-3.45***
Threat to harm/kill him/herself (stalker)		19.1		5.7	35.14***
Onset/duration of stalking	2.89		1.89		-3.08**
Frequency of stalking	2.91		2.80		-1.09
Stalking behaviors still occurring		44.9		33.2	10.25**

Sample size varies due to missing cases. [a] Multiple responses were allowed. [b] Only asked of those victims who were attacked with a weapon (N=36). [c] Based on less than 10 cases. [d] Only asked of those victims who were attacked physically, not with a car or in "some other way" (N=131). * p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Intimate and Nonintimate Stalking Victims' Responses

Bivariate analyses were conducted to test the significance of association between stalking by the victim-offender relationship (intimate versus nonintimate) and the victim responses to stalking victimization. The results of the bivariate analyses are presented in Table 23. The variables which examine victim responses were assessed and combined for data reduction and analysis purposes. These recodes are discussed below.

Why Victims Thought Intimate and Nonintimate Perpetrators Began Stalking

Victims were asked why they felt the offender began stalking them. These reasons (eleven total) were reduced into three general categories with two variables left for separate analysis. The reasons in each general category were then combined to make one scale variable in each category. The reason categories were characteristics of the perpetrator (substance abuser, mentally ill, liked attention, different cultural beliefs (range of 0 to 3)), control (catch victim doing something, control victim, keep victim in relationship (range of 0 to 3)), how perpetrator felt about victim (thought victim liked attention, like victim (range of 0 to 2)), for retaliation (one variable), and proximity (one variable).

T-tests were conducted comparing the mean scores within each of the reported reason categories for why the stalking began (characteristics of perpetrator, control reasons, and how perpetrator felt about victim). Victims of intimate partner stalking reported significantly more reasons in the characteristics of perpetrator category for stalking than victims of nonintimate partner stalking ($t=-3.55$, $p<.001$). Victims of intimate partner stalking reported significantly more reasons in the control category than victims of nonintimate partner stalking ($t=-16.03$, $p<.001$). There was no significant difference found between the mean number of reasons in the

category based on how they thought perpetrator felt about them. Victims of intimate partner stalking were significantly more likely than victims of nonintimate partner stalking to report that the reason the stalking began was for retaliation/anger/spite ($\chi^2(1)=4.40$; $p<.05$). And there was no significant difference found between victims of intimate and nonintimate stalking and the likelihood of feeling that the stalking began because of proximity or convenience.

How Intimate and Nonintimate Partner Stalking Victims Felt

The variables related to how the victim felt when the stalking began and when it progressed were assessed and combined with a count to make a total mean of all emotions scale (all seven variables, range of 0 to 7), depressed or helpless or sick scale (three variables, range of 0 to 3), and anxious or annoyed or frightened scale (three variables, range of 0 to 3). The feeling of being suicidal was included in the total count, but was analyzed separately when examining the types of feelings as being suicidal was decidedly a different emotion. Additionally, the 'no change in feelings' category for how the victim felt when the stalking progressed was left out of the total count and analyzed separately.

T-tests were conducted comparing the mean scores of victims' total emotions, emotions of feeling depressed, helpless, or sick, of feeling anxious, annoyed, or frightened, and feeling suicidal for both when the stalking began and when it progressed by victim-offender relationship. Those who were stalked by an intimate partner felt significantly more total emotions when the stalking began than those stalked by a nonintimate partner ($t=-3.55$, $p<.001$). Those who were stalked by an intimate partner felt significantly more depressed, helpless, and/or sick when the stalking began than those stalked by a nonintimate partner ($t=-4.38$, $p<.001$). Analysis revealed that those who were stalked by an intimate partner also felt significantly more depressed,

helpless, and/or sick when the stalking progressed (t=-3.36, p<.001). While analysis revealed a significant difference between those victims who felt suicidal when the stalking began, the minimum cell counts were not achieved and therefore the test is no longer precise as the assumptions of the chi-square distribution were not met.

Intimate and Nonintimate Partner Stalking Victims' Worst Fears

The ten variables which show victims' worst fears resulting from stalking were combined where the fears each victim experienced were counted to make one total scale variable with a range of 0 to 10. In addition, separate scales were made based on how the fears fit together, three new variables resulted based on fears of no control (loss of job, loss of freedom, lose mind (range of 0 to 3)), unpredictability (behavior would never stop, no knowing what might happen next (range of 0 to 2)), physical harm (death, physical/bodily harm (range of 0 to 2)), and others' safety (harm/kidnap child, harm current partner, harm other family members (range of 0 to 3)).

It appears that for total fears and fear of no control, victims of intimate partner stalking report a greater number of fears than victims of nonintimate partner stalking; however, these differences were not significant. A t-test comparing victims' fear of physical harm of victims of intimate partner stalking to victims of nonintimate partner stalking revealed a significant difference (t=-2.60, p<.01). Those who were stalked by an intimate partner reported significantly greater number of fears of physical harm than those who were stalked by a nonintimate partner.

Intimate and Nonintimate Partner Stalking Victims' Definition of the Behaviors

Bivariate analyses revealed that those who were stalked by an intimate partner were significantly more likely than those who were stalked by a nonintimate partner to have defined the behaviors they experienced as stalking ($\chi^2(1)=6.62$; $p<.01$).

Table 23: Bivariate Test Statistics for Victim Responses to Stalking Victimization by Intimate and Nonintimate Stalking

Variable	Intimate Partner Stalking (N=256)		Nonintimate Partner Stalking (N=623)		Test Statistic t or χ^2
	Mean	%	Mean	%	
Why perpetrator started stalking					
Characteristics of perpetrator	0.71		0.47		-3.55***
Control reasons	1.24		0.28		-16.03***
Based on how perpetrator felt about victim	0.20		0.20		0.07
For retaliation/anger/spite		42.6		35.0	4.40*
Proximity/convenience/victim was alone		7.0		6.8	0.02
How victim felt when stalking began	2.55		2.09		-3.55***
Depressed/Helpless/Sick	0.79		0.45		-4.38***
Anxious/annoyed/frightened	1.72		1.62		-1.51
Suicidal		3.1[a]		1.0[a]	5.39*
How victim felt when stalking progressed	1.37		1.20		-1.45
Depressed/Helpless/Sick	0.44		0.25		-3.36***
Anxious/annoyed/frightened	0.92		0.96		0.52
Suicidal		1.2[a]		0.5[a]	1.26
No change in feelings		31.3		31.1	0.00
Victims' worst fears (total)	1.81		1.65		-1.46
Fear no control	0.27		0.19		-1.90
Fear unpredictability	0.72		0.78		1.05
Fear physical harm	0.48		0.36		-2.60**
Fear for others safety	0.34		0.32		-0.55
Victim defined behaviors as stalking		60.0		50.3	6.62**

Sample size varies due to missing cases.
[a] Based on less than 10 cases. * p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Intimate and Nonintimate Partner Stalking Victims' Reactions and Consequences of Stalking Victimization

Bivariate analyses were conducted to test the significance of association between victim-offender relationship (intimate versus nonintimate) and victim reactions to and consequences of stalking victimization. The results of the bivariate analyses are presented in Table 24. The variables which examine victim reactions were assessed and combined for data reduction and analysis purposes. These recodes are discussed below.

Protective Action Taken and Help Sought by Intimate and Nonintimate Partner Stalking Victims

Actions taken by the victims to protect themselves and the help they sought were examined together in this section. A total count variable was created from all twenty-nine variables, which include all actions taken to protect victim, all help sought by victims, reporting the stalking to the police, and moving in an attempt to stop the stalking. In addition, count variables were made for conceptually similar categories of protective actions and help seeking. These variables were made for the following types of protective action and help – changed activities (took time off from work or school, changed or quit a job or school, changed the way you went to work or school, avoided family/friends, changed your usual activities outside of work or school), sought professional help (talked to an attorney, contacted victim services, a shelter, or help line, talked to a mental health professional, talked to a doctor or nurse, talked to your clergy or faith leader), sought informal help (stayed with family/friends, enlisted the help of friends or family asked people not to release information about you, talked to your boss or employer, contacted your building or office security person), changed personal information (changed your social security number, changed e-mail address, changed telephone number,

installed caller ID or call blocking systems, changed or installed new locks or a security system), sought law enforcement help (hired a private investigator, obtained a restraining, protection, or stay-away order, reported to police), active protection (altered your appearance to be unrecognizable, took self-defense or martial arts classes, moved), and get weapon for protection (got pepper spray, got a gun, got any other kind of weapon).

A t-test was conducted comparing the protective action and help sought by victims total mean scores of victims of intimate partner stalking to victims of nonintimate partner stalking and a significant difference was found ($t=-8.82$, $p<.001$). Victims of intimate partner stalking engaged in significantly more protective and help seeking actions than victims of nonintimate partner stalking. And more specifically, victims of intimate partner stalking engaged in significantly more of the following protective and help seeking actions than victims of nonintimate partner stalking – changed activities ($t=-5.87$, $p<.001$), sought professional help ($t=-6.54$, $p<.001$), sought informal help ($t=-6.11$, $p<.001$), changed personal information ($t=-5.66$, $p<.001$), sought law enforcement help ($t=-5.35$, $p<.001$), active protection methods ($t=-6.39$, $p<.001$), and got weapons for protection ($t=-2.07$, $p<.05$). Overall, victims of intimate partner stalking are engaging in more protective and help seeking actions than those victimized by nonintimate partners.

Consequences of Intimate and Nonintimate Partner Stalking Victimization

No significant difference was found among intimate and nonintimate stalking for the places where the victims moved to in an attempt to have the stalking stop. More victims of intimate stalking experienced the loss of a job due to the unwanted behaviors than victims of nonintimate partner stalking, but this difference was not significant. Victims of intimate partner

stalking were significantly more likely than victims of nonintimate partner stalking to have lost time from work because of fear or concern for safety ($\chi^2(1)=9.47$; $p<.01$), in order to get a restraining or protection order ($\chi^2(1)=30.26$; $p<.001$), and in order to change phone number, move, or fix damaged property ($\chi^2(1)=20.57$; $p<.001$). It appears that victims who are stalked by an intimate partner may experience more negative consequences than victims of nonintimate partner stalking.

Table 24: Bivariate Test Statistics for Victim Reactions to Stalking Victimization by Intimate and Nonintimate Stalking

Variable	Intimate Partner Stalking (N=256)		Nonintimate Partner Stalking (N=623)		Test Statistic t or χ^2
	Mean	%	Mean	%	
Protective action and help sought by victim	6.16		3.32		-8.82***
Changed activities	1.18		0.61		-5.87***
Sought professional help	1.06		0.46		-6.54***
Sought informal help	1.72		1.10		-6.11***
Changed personal information	0.86		0.45		-5.66***
Sought law enforcement help	0.81		0.51		-5.35***
Active protection	0.32		0.12		-6.39***
Got weapon for protection	0.16		0.10		-2.07*
If moved, where to[a]					
A different house/apartment		53.4		57.7	0.22
A different city/state		49.3		50.0	0.01
A shelter or safe house		6.8[b]		3.8[b]	0.52
Some other place		2.7[b]		1.9[b]	0.09
Lost job		5.1		3.1	2.05
Reason lost time from work					
Fear or concern for safety		22.9		13.0	9.47**
Getting a restraining/protection order or testifying in court		27.1		9.7	30.26***
Changing phone number/ moving/ fixing damaged property		16.1		5.0	20.57***

Sample size varies due to missing cases.
[a] Multiple responses were allowed. [b] Based on less than 10 cases.
* p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Other Crimes Experienced by Victims of Intimate and Nonintimate Partner Stalking

Bivariate analyses were conducted to test the significance of association between victim-offender relationship (intimate versus nonintimate) and the other victimization that victims may have experienced. The results of the bivariate analyses are presented in Table 25.

Because these data are part of the larger NCVS, other victimization may be examined. Other victimization can include both household and personal victimization. The analyses were completed on the separate crime variables of both household and personal victimization where 1=victim and 2=not a victim. The household victimization variables include break in, motor vehicle theft, identity theft, and vandalism. And the personal victimization variables include theft, break in, motor vehicle theft, attack with location cues as to where the incident occurred, attack with types of weapons, attack where the offender was known, and forced or coerced unwanted sex. To be consistent with all previous analysis, the following analyses were only completed on victims of stalking.

For household victimization, the most common victimization experienced was vandalism. It appears that for most household victimization (except attack, threat, or theft during vandalism), victims of intimate partner stalking experienced more household victimization; however, these differences were not significant. For personal victimization, the most common victimization experienced was theft. Again, for most personal victimization (except break in), victims of intimate partner stalking appear to have experienced more personal victimization; however, these differences were not significant.

Table 25: Other Victimization Experienced by Victims of IP and Non-IP Stalking

Variable	All Stalking (N=983)	IP Stalking (N=256)	Non-IP Stalking (N=623)
	%	%	%
Household victimization			
Broken in or attempted	5.8	6.5	4.7
Motor vehicle theft	3.4	3.3[a]	2.9
Identity theft			
Used credit card without permission	5.2	5.5	4.3
Used other accounts without permission	5.3	6.7	4.7
Used personal information for theft/fraud	4.8	6.3	4.0
Vandalism	10.0	12.1	9.1
Attack, threat, theft during vandalism[b]	6.1[a]	3.2[a]	8.8[a]
Person victimization			
Something stolen or attempted	13.3	15.2	12.8
Broken in or attempted	6.9	1.8	5.3
Motor vehicle theft	3.0	3.7[a]	2.8[a]
Attack, threat, theft (location cues)	8.4	9.4	7.4
Attack, threat (weapon cues)	4.5	5.1	4.3
Stolen, attack, threat (offender known)	1.4	1.6[a]	1.4[a]
Forced or coerced unwanted sex	0.8[a]	1.2[a]	0.6[a]

Sample size varies due to missing cases. [a] Based on less than 10 cases. [b] Only asked of those who reported vandalism.
* p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Other Crimes Experienced by Victims of Intimate and Nonintimate Partner Stalking with Victim-Offender Relationship

Bivariate analyses were conducted to test the significance of association between victim-offender relationship (intimate versus nonintimate) and the other victimization by the victim-offender relationship that victims may have experienced. The results of the bivariate analyses are presented in Table 26.

In order to obtain the victim-offender relationship of the other crimes experienced by stalking victims, the NCVS incident file had to be merged with the SVS file. In the NCVS, an incident is considered a criminal act that may involve multiple victimizations (determined by the number of victims), and as such the estimates of personal incidents may be lower than estimates of personal victimization. And again to be consistent with all previous analysis, the following analyses were only completed on victims of stalking. So, the following analyses were only completed on those who were both victims of other NCVS victimizations and stalking victims.

The victim-offender relationship variable in the incident file was recoded to reflect two categories (1) intimate partner and (0) nonintimate partner. This variable was then combined with the other victimization variables to have a victim-offender and victimization variable for each victimization where 1=victim of intimate perpetrated crime, 2=victim of nonintimate perpetrated crime, and 3=not a victim of that crime (e.g. 1=victim of theft by an IP, 2=victim of theft by a non-IP, 3=not a victim of theft).

For household incidents, the most common incident with an intimate partner offender appears to be using other accounts without permission. And the most common incident with a nonintimate partner offender appears to be attacks, threats, or theft during vandalism. It appears

that those who are experiencing intimate partner stalking are experiencing more other intimate partner perpetrated incidents than nonintimate partner perpetrated incidents; and the same appears for those who experienced nonintimate partner stalking. Significant differences were found among break in incidents and incidents where the perpetrator used other accounts without permission; however, the minimum cell counts were not achieved and therefore assumptions of the chi-square distribution were not met.

For personal incidents, the most common incident with an intimate partner perpetrator appears to be attack by location type (included location cues, i.e. at work or school). And the most common incident with a nonintimate partner perpetrator appears to be theft. It appears that those who are experiencing intimate partner stalking are experiencing more other intimate partner perpetrated personal incidents than nonintimate partner perpetrated personal incidents; and the same appears true for those who experienced nonintimate partner stalking. Significant differences were found among theft, break in, attack by location, and attack with weapons incidents; however, the minimum cell counts were not achieved and therefore the test is no longer precise as the assumptions of the chi-square distribution were not met.

Table 26: Other Victimization by Victim-Offender Relationship Experienced by IP and Non-IP Stalking Victimization

Variable	Intimate Partner Stalking (N=126)		Nonintimate Partner Stalking (N=215)	
Victim-Offender Relationship	% IP	% Non-IP	% IP	% Non-IP
Household victimization				
Broken in or attempted*	5.4[a]	2.2[a]	0.6[a]	5.0[a]
Motor vehicle theft	6.7[a]	----	----	1.4[a]
Identity theft				
Used credit card without permission	4.3[a]	0.9[a]	1.0[a]	1.0[a]
Used other accounts without permission**	8.0[a]	3.6[a]	0.5[a]	3.6[a]
Used personal information for theft/fraud	4.5[a]	----	----	2.6[a]
Vandalism	4.5[a]	4.3	----	4.7[a]
Attack, threat, theft during vandalism[b]	4.5[a]	9.1[a]	----	3.7[a]
Person victimization				
Something stolen or attempted**	17.3	12.3	3.4[a]	22.0
Broken in or attempted*	6.8[a]	2.7[a]	0.8[a]	6.1[a]
Motor vehicle theft	7.1[a]	----	----	1.8[a]
Attack, threat, theft (location cues)***	21.5	5.3[a]	2.7[a]	17.2
Attack, threat (weapon cues)*	9.4	2.6[a]	5.5	10.6
Stolen, attack, threat (offender known)	0.8[a]	1.6[a]	----	2.9[a]
Forced or coerced unwanted sex	2.4[a]	----	0.5[a]	1.9[a]

Sample size varies due to missing cases. [a] Based on less than 10 cases. [b] Only asked of those who reported vandalism.
* p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Chapter Summary

This chapter provided an overview of differences between intimate and nonintimate stalking. Differences in the nature of stalking, severity of stalking, victim responses, victim reactions, and consequences of victimization were examined. Overall, when compared to victims of nonintimate partner stalking, victims of intimate partner stalking experienced more types of stalking behaviors, more crimes committed in conjunction with their stalking victimization, more attacks on them or others, more threats, more emotions, more fear of physical harm, and more negative consequences. And victims of intimate partner stalking were more likely than victims of nonintimate partner stalking to have felt that the perpetrator began stalking due to control and for retaliation or anger. Additionally, victims of intimate partner stalking experienced stalking for a significantly longer duration than victims of nonintimate partner stalking. Victims of intimate partner stalking engaged in more protective and help-seeking actions than those victimized by nonintimate partners. The next chapter examines these differences among stalking types.

CHAPTER SIX: COMPARING CYBERSTALKING, STALKING WITH TECHNOLOGY, AND TRADITIONAL STALKING

This next section further examines the nature of stalking, severity of stalking, victim responses, victim reactions, and consequences of victimization by stalking type. The same variables that were combined and reduced for Chapter 5 are used in the following analyses. To be consistent with all previous analysis, the following analyses were only completed with victims of stalking. And, as previously mentioned, due to the small sample size in the both cyberstalked and stalked with technology category, these respondents were excluded from all further analysis as there were not enough in this category to complete meaningful analysis. Further, to avoid duplications all analyses that were the same as analyses in Chapter 4 were excluded (i.e. chi-square analyses) since the comparison groups remained the same in this chapter (i.e. cyberstalking, stalking with technology, and traditional stalking).

Nature of Stalking by Cyberstalking, Stalking with Technology, and Traditional Stalking

Bivariate analyses were completed to test the significance of association between stalking type and the nature of the stalking incidents. The results of the bivariate analyses are presented in Table 27.

Stalking Behaviors Experienced by Stalking Victims

An analysis of variance revealed a significant difference in the mean score on the stalking behavior scale in the three categories of stalking type ($F(2,951)=23.30$, $p<.001$). Post-hoc tests identified significant differences for those who were cyberstalked and stalked with

technology. Those who were cyberstalked and stalked with technology experienced significantly more types of stalking behaviors than those who were traditionally stalked.

Other Crimes Perpetrated Against Victims or Other Persons

Analyses of variance were completed comparing the mean total number of all crimes, property crimes, and identity theft crimes perpetrated against the victims in conjunction with the stalking victimization. Post-hoc tests identified significant differences in the number of total crimes ($F(2,951)=7.06$, $p<.01$) and property crimes ($F(2,951)=8.10$, $p<.001$) committed against those who were stalked with technology were found. Those who were stalked with technology had experienced significantly more overall crimes and more property crimes than those who were cyberstalked and traditionally stalked. No significant difference was found in the mean number of identity theft crimes experienced by victims.

Analyses of variance were completed comparing the mean number of attacks on others and on victims that were committed in conjunction with their stalking victimization. Post-hoc tests revealed a significant difference in the mean number of attacks on others for those who were stalked with technology ($F(2,951)=3.21$, $p<.05$). Victims who were stalked with technology experienced significantly more attacks or attempted attacks against others than victims who were cyberstalked and traditionally stalked. No significant difference was found between the stalking types and the number of attacks on the victim.

Threats Made against Victims

Analyses of variance were completed comparing the mean total number of threats, threats against others, and threats against the victims. Significant differences were found in the total

number of threats ($F(2,951)=6.56$, $p<.001$) and direct threats against the victims ($F(2,951)=9.50$, $p<.001$). Post-hoc tests revealed significant differences for those stalked with technology. Those victims who were stalked with technology experienced significantly more threats overall and more direct threats against themselves than both those who were cyberstalked and traditionally stalked.

Onset, Duration, and Frequency of Stalking

Analyses of variance were completed comparing the mean years of stalking occurrence and mean frequency of stalking by stalking type. No significant difference was found among the mean years of stalking occurrence. A significant difference in the mean frequency of stalking by the three types of stalking was found ($F(2,687)=6.49$, $p<.01$). Post-hoc tests indicated that those who were stalked with technology experienced a significantly higher frequency of stalking comparing to those who were traditionally stalked. And with regard to whether the stalking was still occurring, those stalked with technology were significantly more likely to have reported that the behaviors were still ongoing compared to those who were cyberstalked or traditionally stalked ($\chi^2=10.60$, $p<.01$).

Table 27: Bivariate Test Statistics for Stalking Characteristics by Stalking Type

	Cyberstalked (N=163)	Stalked with Technology (N=44)	Traditional (N=747)
Variable	Mean	Mean	Mean
Stalking behaviors experienced by victims	3.23	3.36	2.36***
Total other crimes perpetrated against victim	0.93	1.68	0.82**
Property crimes	0.37	0.70	0.30***
Identity theft	0.11	0.09	0.07
Attack or attempted attack on others	0.15	0.36	0.18*
Attack or attempted attack on victim	0.29	0.52	0.28
Threats made against victims (total)	0.76	1.36	0.69***
Threats against others	0.17	0.32	0.17
Threats against victim	0.48	0.98	0.45***
Onset/duration of stalking	1.65	3.27	2.36
Frequency of stalking	2.95	3.48	2.76**

Sample size varies due to missing cases.
* p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Victims' Responses to Cyberstalking, Stalking with Technology, and Traditional Stalking

Bivariate analyses were conducted to test the significance of association between stalking types and the victim responses to stalking victimization. The results of the bivariate analyses are presented in Table 28.

Why Victims Thought Perpetrators Began Stalking

Analyses of variance were completed comparing the mean scores within each of the reported reason categories for why the stalking began (characteristics of perpetrator, control reasons, and how perpetrator felt about victim) by stalking type. Significant differences were

found for the control ($F(2,951)=6.46$, $p<.01$) and how perpetrator felt about victim ($F(2,951)=6.40$, $p<.01$) categories. Post-hoc tests revealed that those who were cyberstalked reported significantly more reasons in the control category than those who were traditionally stalked, and more reasons based on how the perpetrator felt about victim categories than those who were stalked with technology and traditionally stalked. No significant differences were found in the mean scores within the characteristics of the perpetrator category. Additionally, no significant differences were found between stalking type and the likelihood of reporting that the stalking began because of retaliation or spite or because of proximity or convenience.

How Stalking Victims Felt

Analyses of variance were conducted comparing the mean scores of victims' total emotions, emotions of feeling depressed, helpless, or sick, of feeling anxious, annoyed, or frightened, and feeling suicidal for both when the stalking began and when it progressed by stalking type. No significant differences were found among the mean score of emotions felt when the stalking began. Significant differences were found among victims' overall emotions ($F(2,951)=6.19$, $p<.01$) and feeling depressed, helpless, or sick ($F(2,951)=7.26$, $p<.01$) when the stalking progressed. Post-hoc tests revealed that victims who were stalked with technology felt significantly more overall emotions and feeling depressed, helpless, or sick as the stalking progressed.

Stalking Victims' Worst Fears

Analyses of variance were conducted comparing the mean score on the total fears, fear of no control, fear unpredictability, fear physical harm, and fear for other safety scales by stalking

type. It appears that those who are stalked with technology report greater number of fears, but significant differences were only found on the fear physical harm scale ($F(2,951)=3.28$, $p<.05$). Post-hoc tests revealed that those who were stalked with technology reported significantly greater number of fears of physical harm than those who were cyberstalked.

Table 28: Bivariate Test Statistics for Victim Responses to Stalking Victimization by Stalking Type

	Cyberstalked (N=163)	Stalked with Technology (N=44)	Traditional (N=747)
Variable	Mean	Mean	Mean
Why perpetrator started stalking			
Characteristics of perpetrator	0.41	0.48	0.53
Control reasons	0.70	0.64	0.47**
Based on how perpetrator felt about victim	0.28	0.09	0.16***
How victim felt when stalking began	2.30	2.43	2.12
Depressed/Helpless/Sick	0.58	0.70	0.50
Anxious/annoyed/frightened	1.70	1.68	1.61
How victim felt when stalking progressed	1.36	1.80	1.12**
Depressed/Helpless/Sick	0.37	0.59	0.24**
Anxious/annoyed/frightened	0.98	1.18	0.88
Victims' worst fears (total)	1.76	2.13	1.61*
Fear no control	0.23	0.34	0.18
Fear unpredictability	0.87	0.86	0.72
Fear physical harm	0.32	0.52	0.39*
Fear for others safety	0.34	0.36	0.31

Sample size varies due to missing cases.
* p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Victims' Reactions and Consequences of Cyberstalking, Stalking with Technology, and Traditional Stalking

Bivariate analyses were conducted to test the significance of association between stalking type and victim reactions to and consequences of stalking victimization. The results of the bivariate analyses are presented in Table 29.

Protective Action Taken and Help Sought by Stalking Victims

Analyses of variance were completed comparing the protective action and help sought by victims total mean scores, as well as the mean scores of the specific help sought or protective action scales by stalking type. Significant differences were found in mean scores of total protective and help seeking actions ($F(2,951)=23.59$, $p<.001$), changed activities ($F(2,951)=21.36$, $p<.001$), sought professional help ($F(2,951)=20.68$, $p<.001$), sought informal help ($F(2,951)=11.87$, $p<.001$), changed personal information ($F(2,951)=8.00$, $p<.001$), active protection ($F(2,951)=7.62$, $p<.001$), and got weapons for protection ($F(2,951)=7.47$, $p<.001$). Post-hoc analyses revealed that victims who were cyberstalked and/or stalked with technology engaged in more total protective and help seeking actions, as well as, changed activities, sought professional help, and sought informal help than those who were traditionally stalked. Additionally, those who were cyberstalked engaged in significantly more actions to change their personal information than those who were traditionally stalked. And those who were stalked with technology engaged in significantly more total protective and help seeking actions, as well as sought professional help than those who were cyberstalked. Finally, those who were stalked with technology also engaged in significantly more actions that were active protection and got weapons for protection than both those who were cyberstalked and traditionally stalked.

Table 29: Bivariate Test Statistics for Victim Reactions to Stalking Victimization by Stalking Type

	Cyberstalked (N=163)	Stalked with Technology (N=44)	Traditional (N=747)
Variable	Mean	Mean	Mean
Protective action and help sought by victim	4.94	6.72	3.48***
Changed activities	1.04	1.45	0.60***
Sought professional help	0.78	1.43	0.48***
Sought informal help	1.58	1.59	1.10***
Changed personal information	0.72	0.77	0.47***
Sought law enforcement help	0.52	0.77	0.47
Active protection	0.18	0.39	0.14**
Got weapon for protection	0.11	0.32	0.10**

Sample size varies due to missing cases.
* p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Other Crimes Experienced by Victims of Cyberstalking, Stalking with Technology, and Traditional Stalking

Bivariate analyses were conducted to test the significance of association between stalking type and the other victimization that victims may have experienced. The results of the bivariate analyses are presented in Table 30.

The most common household victimization for those who were cyberstalked was using credit card and/or other accounts without permission. The most common household victimization for those who were stalked with technology was a break-in. And the most common household victimization for those traditionally stalked was vandalism. Further, those who were

stalked with technology were significantly more likely to have experienced their personal information being used for theft/fraud (χ^2=8.81, p<.01) than those who were cyberstalked or traditionally stalked.

The most commonly experienced personal victimization by both victims who were cyberstalked and traditionally stalked was theft. The most common personal victimization for those stalked with technology was an attack, threat, or theft that occurred at a certain location. Victims who were stalked with technology were significantly more likely than those cyberstalked or traditionally stalked to have experienced an attack, threat, or theft at a specific location (χ^2=23.87, p<.001). Bivariate analyses revealed significant associations for those victims who were attacked or threatened by a weapon or force; however the minimum cell counts were not achieved and therefore it is inappropriate to interpret as the test was not robust.

Table 30: Other Victimization Experienced by Stalking Victimization Type

Variable	Cyberstalked (N=163)	Stalked with Technology (N=44)	Traditional (N=747)
	%	%	%
Household victimization			
Broken in or attempted	4.5[a]	15.4[a]	5.5
Motor vehicle theft	2.4[a]	2.8[a]	3.8
Identity theft			
Used credit card without permission	6.7	4.5[a]	4.8
Used other accounts without permission	6.7	2.3[a]	5.0
Used personal information for theft/fraud	6.2	14.3[a]	3.9**
Vandalism	5.5[a]	6.8[a]	11.1
Attack, threat, theft during vandalism[b]	22.2[a]	----	4.8[a]
Person victimization			
Something stolen or attempted	11.7	22.7	13.1
Broken in or attempted	5.1[a]	19.2[a]	6.6
Motor vehicle theft	2.2[a]	4.3[a]	3.2
Attack, threat, theft (location cues)	4.9[a]	27.3	7.4***
Attack, threat (weapon cues)	2.5[a]	18.2[a]	4.1***
Stolen, attack, threat (offender known)	1.2[a]	----	1.5
Forced or coerced unwanted sex	----	2.3[a]	0.8[a]

Sample size varies due to missing cases. [a] Based on less than 10 cases. [b] Only asked of those who reported vandalism.
* p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Examining Cyberstalking, Stalking with Technology, and Traditional Stalking by Victim-Offender Relationship

The next set of analyses examines the nature of stalking, severity of stalking, victim responses, victim reactions, and consequences of victimization by stalking type and victim-offender relationship (intimate versus non-intimate). To be consistent with previous analyses, these analyses were only completed on stalking victims. And again, to avoid duplications all analyses that were the same as analyses in Chapter 4 were excluded (i.e. chi-square analyses) since the comparison groups remained the same in this chapter (i.e. IP versus non-IP cyberstalking, IP versus non-IP stalking with technology, and IP versus non-IP traditional stalking). Additionally, so the comparisons will remain the same, the means based analysis that will be completed for each relevant variable will be a t-test so that comparisons are being made within each stalking type by victim-offender relationship (i.e. IP cyberstalking versus non-IP cyberstalking). The individual means for each of the variables are shown in the tables (Tables 31-33), and the relationships which are significant at the bivariate level are discussed below.

Nature of Stalking by Cyberstalking, Stalking with Technology, and Traditional Stalking and Victim-Offender Relationship

Bivariate analyses were conducted to test the significance of association between stalking type by victim-offender relationship and the nature of the stalking incidents. The results of the analyses are presented in Table 31.

Stalking Behaviors Experienced by Stalking Victims

T-tests were conducted comparing the mean scores of victims by stalking type and victim-offender relationship on the stalking behavior scale. Victims who were traditionally stalked by an IP experienced significantly more types of stalking behaviors than those who were traditionally stalked by a non-IP ($t=-5.90$, $p<.001$).

Other Crimes Perpetrated Against Victims or Other Persons

Bivariate analyses (t-tests) were completed comparing the mean amount of crime perpetrated against the victims in conjunction with stalking by the type of stalking and victim-offender relationship. Victims who were cyberstalked by an IP experienced significantly more overall crimes ($t=-2.54$, $p<.05$), property crimes ($t=-2.56$, $p<.05$), and attacks on themselves ($t=.2.52$, $p<.05$) than those who were cyberstalked by a non-IP. And victims who were traditionally stalked by an IP experienced significantly more overall crimes ($t=-5.33$, $p<.001$), property crimes ($t=-4.24$, $p<.001$), identity theft ($t=-3.24$, $p<.001$), and attacks on themselves ($t=-4.99$, $p<.001$) than those who were traditionally stalked by a non-IP.

Threats Made against Victims

The mean score of total threats against victims, threats against others, and threats again the victim were compared using t-tests across stalking type and victim-offender relationship. Those victims who were traditionally stalked by an IP experienced significantly more total threats ($t=-3.76$, $p<.001$), threats against others ($t=-2.12$, $p<.05$), and threats against themselves ($t=-2.99$, $p<.01$) than those who were traditionally stalked by a non-IP.

Onset, Duration, and Frequency of Stalking

T-tests were conducted comparing the mean duration scores across stalking type and victim-offender relationship. A significant difference was found among those traditionally stalked ($t=-2.94$, $p<.01$). Those who are traditionally stalked by an IP have experienced the stalking for a significantly longer duration than victims who were stalked by a non-IP. No significant difference was found on the either frequency of stalking or whether or not the stalking was still ongoing by stalking type and victim-offender relationship.

Table 31: Bivariate Test Statistics for Stalking Characteristics by Stalking Type and Victim-Offender Relationship

Variable	Cyber by IP (N=51) Mean	Cyber by Non-IP (N=94) Mean	Technology by IP (N=12) Mean	Technology by Non-IP (N=26) Mean	Traditional by IP (N=185) Mean	Traditional by Non-IP (N=490) Mean
Stalking behaviors experienced by victims	3.53	3.07	3.75	3.15	3.06	2.17***
Total other crimes perpetrated against victim	1.43	0.69*	2.41	1.27	1.95	1.25***
Property crimes	0.59	0.23*	0.92	0.50	0.85	0.54***
Identity theft	0.22	0.06	0.25	0.04	0.53	0.22***
Attack or attempted attack on others	0.08	0.21	0.42	0.35	0.52	0.51
Attack or attempted attack on victim	0.55	0.18*	0.83	0.38	0.99	0.52***
Threats made against victims (total)	0.80	0.77	2.17	1.11	1.07	0.60***
Threats against others	0.12	0.19	0.58	0.23	0.25	0.15*
Threats against victim	0.53	0.50	1.42	0.85	0.64	0.41**
Onset/duration of stalking	1.61	1.53	4.86	2.18*	3.15	1.94**
Frequency of stalking	2.98	2.95	3.56	3.26	2.83	2.73

Sample size varies due to missing cases.
* p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Victims' Responses to Cyberstalking, Stalking with Technology, and Traditional Stalking by Victim-Offender Relationship

Bivariate analyses were conducted to test the significance of association between stalking type by victim-offender relationship and the victim responses to stalking victimization. The results of the bivariate analyses are presented in Table 32.

Why Victims Thought Perpetrators Began Stalking

T-tests were conducted comparing the reasons why victims felt the stalking began among stalking type and victim-offender relationship. Those who were traditionally stalked by an IP reported significantly more reasons in the characteristics of the perpetrator category than those who were traditionally stalked by a non-IP ($t=-3.10$, $p<.01$). And those who were cyberstalked by an IP ($t=-4.66$, $p<.001$), stalked with technology by an IP ($t=-3.43$, $p<.01$), and traditionally stalked by an IP ($t=-14.86$, $p<.001$) reported significantly more reasons in the control category than those stalked in these manners by a non-IP.

How Stalking Victims Felt

The mean scores of victims' total emotions, emotions of feeling depressed, helpless, or sick, of feeling anxious, annoyed, or frightened, and feeling suicidal for both when the stalking began and when it progressed were compared by stalking type and victim-offender relationship. Those who were traditionally stalked by an IP felt significantly more overall emotions ($t=-2.88$, $p<.01$) and feeling depressed, helpless, or sick ($t=-3.76$, $p<.001$) when the stalking began than those who were traditionally stalked by a non-IP. And those who were traditionally stalked by

an IP felt more depressed, helpless, or sick emotions ($t=-2.74$, $p<.01$) when the stalking progressed than those who were traditionally stalked by a non-IP.

Stalking Victims' Worst Fears

It appears that victims' worst fears among those who were cyberstalked and those who were stalked with technology were similar across victim-offender relationship. There appear to be differences among those who were traditionally stalked by an IP versus those who were traditionally stalked by a non-IP. And a t-test comparing victims' fear of physical harm of victims traditionally stalked by an IP to victims traditionally stalked by a non-IP revealed a significant difference ($t=-2.68$, $p<.01$). Those who were traditionally stalked by an IP reported significantly greater number of fears of physical harm than those traditionally stalked by a non-IP.

Table 32: Bivariate Test Statistics for Victim Responses to Stalking Victimization by Stalking Type

Variable	Cyber by IP (N=51) Mean	Cyber by Non-IP (N=94) Mean	Technology by IP (N=12) Mean	Technology by Non-IP (N=26) Mean	Traditional by IP (N=185) Mean	Traditional by Non-IP (N=490) Mean
Why perpetrator started stalking						
Characteristics of perpetrator	0.59	0.43	0.58	0.54	0.73	0.48**
Control reasons	1.20	0.48***	1.33	0.46**	1.23	0.22***
Based on how perpetrator felt about victim	0.9	0.33	0.08	0.12	0.17	0.18
How victim felt when stalking began	2.55	2.15	2.50	2.54	2.45	2.02**
Depressed/Helpless/Sick	0.75	0.46	0.67	0.81	0.75	0.42***
Anxious/annoyed/frightened	1.78	1.67	1.83	1.69	1.67	1.60
How victim felt when stalking progressed	1.41	1.36	1.92	1.85	1.26	1.22
Depressed/Helpless/Sick	0.45	0.30	0.75	0.62	0.38	0.21**
Anxious/annoyed/frightened	0.94	1.05	1.17	1.23	0.88	0.91
Victims' worst fears (total)	1.75	1.78	2.42	2.23	1.72	1.59
Fear no control	0.25	0.23	0.33	0.38	0.23	0.17
Fear unpredictability	0.78	0.91	1.00	0.92	0.67	0.75
Fear physical harm	0.35	0.30	0.67	0.54	0.50	0.36**
Fear for others safety	0.35	0.33	0.42	0.38	0.32	0.31

Sample size varies due to missing cases.
* p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Victims' Reactions and Consequences of Cyberstalking, Stalking with Technology, and Traditional Stalking by Victim-Offender Relationship

Bivariate analyses were completed to test the significance of association between stalking type by victim-offender relationship and victim reactions to and consequences of stalking victimization. The results of the bivariate analyses are presented in Table 33.

Protective Action Taken and Help Sought by Stalking Victims

T-tests were implemented to compare the total mean scores of victims' protective action and help sought among stalking type and victim-offender relationship and revealed significant differences. Victims who were cyberstalked by an IP ($t=-2.79$, $p<.01$) and traditionally stalked by an IP ($t=-8.36$, $p<.001$) engaged in significantly more protective and help seeking actions than victims who were cyberstalked and traditionally stalked by a non-IP. And more specifically, victims of cyberstalking by an IP engaged in significantly more of the following protective and help seeking actions than victims of cyberstalking by a non-IP – changed activities ($t=-2.13$, $p<.05$), sought professional help ($t=-2.81$, $p<.01$), sought informal help ($t=-2.10$, $p<.05$), and sought law enforcement help ($t=-2.66$, $p<.01$). Victims who were cyberstalked by an IP were significantly less likely to have obtained weapons for protection than those who were cyberstalked by a non-IP ($t=2.58$, $p<.05$). And victims of traditional stalking by an IP engaged in significantly more of the following protective and help seeking actions than victims of traditional stalking by a non-IP – changed activities ($t=-5.07$, $p<.001$), sought professional help ($t=-5.71$, $p<.001$), sought informal help ($t=-5.50$, $p<.001$), changed personal information ($t=-5.53$, $p<.001$), sought law enforcement help ($t=-4.07$, $p<.001$), active protection methods ($t=-$

6.30, p<.001), and got weapons for protections (t=-2.65, p<.01). Overall, victims of intimate partner cyberstalking and traditional stalking are engaging in more protective and help seeking actions than those victimized by nonintimate partners.

Table 33: Bivariate Test Statistics for Victim Reactions to Stalking Victimization by Stalking Type

Variable	Cyber by IP (N=51)	Cyber by Non-IP (N=94)	Technology by IP (N=12)	Technology by Non-IP (N=26)	Traditional by IP (N=185)	Traditional by Non-IP (N=490)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Protective action and help sought by victim	6.43	4.11**	9.00	5.92	5.63	2.85***
Changed activities	1.35	0.81*	2.08	1.19	1.01	0.49***
Sought professional help	1.20	0.56**	1.92	1.27	0.92	0.36***
Sought informal help	1.92	1.43*	1.92	1.58	1.61	0.97***
Changed personal information	0.92	0.65	1.00	0.73	0.78	0.36***
Sought law enforcement help	0.73	0.38**	1.67	0.65	0.81	0.53***
Active protection	0.29	0.15	0.58	0.23	0.33	0.08***
Got weapon for protection	0.02	0.14*	0.33	0.27	0.17	0.08**

Sample size varies due to missing cases.
* p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Other Crimes Experienced by Victims of Cyberstalking, Stalking with Technology, and Traditional Stalking

Bivariate analyses were conducted to test the significance of association between stalking type by victim-offender relationship (intimate versus nonintimate) and other victimization that victims may have experienced. The results of the bivariate analyses are presented in Table 34.

For household victimization, vandalism was a common experience among those cyberstalked by an IP and traditionally stalked by an IP and a non-IP. Those who were cyberstalked by a non-IP and stalked with technology by an IP appear to have been more likely to have experienced identity theft. Overall, it appears that victims of intimate partner stalking (regardless of the type) experienced more household victimization; however, these differences are not significant. For personal victimization, the most common victimization experienced was theft. Overall, it appears that victims of intimate partner stalking (regardless of the type) experienced more personal victimization; however, these differences are not significant.

Table 34: Other Victimization Experienced by Stalking Victimization Type and Victim-Offender Relationship

Variable	Cyber by IP (N=51)	Cyber by Non-IP (N=94)	Technology by IP (N=12)	Technology by Non-IP (N=26)	Traditional by IP (N=185)	Traditional by Non-IP (N=490)
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Household victimization						
Broken in or attempted	4.3 (2)	2.8 (2)	18.2 (2)	8.7 (2)	6.6 (11)	4.9 (19)
Motor vehicle theft	----	3.1 (2)	----	4.8 (1)	4.6 (7)	2.8 (10)
Identity theft						
Used credit card without permission	7.8 (4)	5.3 (5)	8.3 (1)	3.8 (1)	4.9 (9)	4.3 (21)
Used other accounts without permission	9.8 (5)	5.3 (5)	8.3 (1)	----	6.0 (11)	4.3 (21)
Used personal information for theft/fraud	7.8 (4)	4.3 (4)	33.3 (4)	7.7 (2)	3.8 (7)	3.9 (19)
Vandalism	9.8 (5)	4.3 (4)	8.3 (1)	3.8 (1)	13.5 (25)	10.2 (50)
Attack, threat, theft during vandalism[a]	----	50.0 (2)	----	----	4.0 (1)	6.0 (3)
Person victimization						
Something stolen or attempted	11.8 (6)	11.7 (11)	33.3 (4)	11.5 (3)	15.1 (28)	13.1 (64)
Broken in or attempted	5.3 (2)	1.9 (1)	20.0 (2)	8.3 (1)	7.6 (10)	5.9 (17)
Motor vehicle theft	----	4.3 (2)	----	10.0 (1)	5.1 (6)	2.4 (6)
Attack, threat, theft (location cues)	3.9 (2)	4.3 (4)	16.7 (2)	23.1 (6)	9.7 (18)	7.0 (34)
Attack, threat (weapon cues)	5.9 (3)	1.1 (1)	25.0 (3)	15.4 (4)	3.8 (7)	4.3 (21)
Stolen, attack, threat (offender known)	----	2.1 (2)	----	----	2.2 (4)	1.2 (6)
Forced or coerced unwanted sex	----	----	8.3 (1)	----	0.5 (1)	0.8 (4)

Sample size varies due to missing cases. Frequencies in parentheses for percentages. [a] Only asked of those who reported vandalism.
* p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Other Crimes Experienced by Victims of Cyberstalking, Stalking with Technology, and Traditional Stalking with Victim-Offender Relationship

Bivariate analyses were conducted to examine the association between other victimization that stalking victims may have experienced by stalking type and victim-offender relationship. The results of the bivariate analyses are presented in Table 35. The following analyses were only completed on those who were both victims of other NCVS victimizations and stalking victims.

It is difficult to make comparisons among those who were cyberstalked and stalked with technology as there is so much missing data. It does appear that overall those who were stalked by a non-IP appear to have also experienced other crimes by non-IPs. Those who were traditionally stalked by an IP appear to have experienced a greater amount of other victimization by an IP than those stalked by a non-IP. Significant differences were found for personal victimization of theft and attack with weapon or force; however, the minimum cell counts were not achieved and therefore it is inappropriate to interpret as the test was not robust.

Table 35: Other Victimization by Victim-Offender Relationship Experienced by Stalking Victimization Type

Variable	Cyber by IP (N=51)		Cyber by Non-IP (N=94)		Technology by IP (N=12)		Technology by Non-IP (N=26)		Traditional by IP (N=185)		Traditional by Non-IP (N=490)	
Victim-Offender Relationship	% IP	% Non-IP	% IP	% Non-IP	% IP	% Non-IP	% IP	% Non-IP	% IP	% Non-IP	% IP	% Non-IP
Household victimization												
Broken in or attempted	7.7(1)	----	----	11.1(2)	----	----	----	----	6.1(4)	3.0(1)	0.8(1)	4.9(6)
Motor vehicle theft	----	----	----	9.1(1)	----	----	----	----	10.3(6)	----	----	0.9(1)
Identity theft												
Used credit card without permission	----	5.9(1)	4.5(1)	----	----	----	----	----	6.3(5)	----	0.6(1)	1.2(1)
Used other accounts without permission	6.3(1)	6.3(1)	4.8(1)	9.5(2)	----	----	----	----	10.5(8)	3.9(3)	----	3.3(5)
Used personal information for theft/fraud	----	----	-----	----	----	----	----	6.7(1)	6.3(5)	----	----	2.6(4)
Vandalism	----	5.9(1)	----	----	----	----	----	----	6.6(5)	3.9(3)	----	6.0(9)
Attack, threat, theft during vandalism[a]	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	5.9(1)	11.8(2)	----	4.0(1)
Person victimization												
Something stolen or attempted	----	15.4(2)	13.3(2)	13.3(2)	20.0(1)	----	7.7(1)	7.7(1)	23.2(13)	14.8(8)	1.2(1)	24.4(21)**
Broken in or attempted	10.0(1)	----	----	11.8(2)	----	----	----	----	7.3(4)	3.6(2)	0.9(1)	5.6(6)
Motor vehicle theft	----	----	----	10.0(1)	-----	----	----	----	10.6(5)	----	----	1.0(1)
Attack, threat, theft (location cues)	5.6(1)	5.6(1)	----	13.6(3)	----	----	38.5(5)	23.1(3)	26.3(20)	5.3(4)	----	15.8(23)
Attack, threat (weapon cues)	11.8(2)	----	4.3(1)	----	10.0(1)	10.0(1)	46.2(6)	7.7(1)	9.8(8)	2.4(2)	2.5(4)	11.4(18)**
Stolen, attack, threat (offender known)	----	----	----	4.3(1)	----	----	----	----	1.2(1)	2.4(2)	----	3.0(5)
Forced or coerced unwanted sex	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1.2(1)	----	0.6(1)	2.4(4)

Sample size varies due to missing cases. Frequencies in parentheses for percentages. [a] Only asked of those who reported vandalism. * p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Chapter Summary

This chapter examined difference in the nature of stalking, severity of stalking, victim responses, victim reactions, and consequences of victimization by stalking type and victim-offender relationship. Victims of both cyberstalking and stalking with technology experienced significantly more types of behaviors, experienced more emotions related to their victimization, were more likely to define the behaviors as stalking, and engaged in more protective actions than those who were traditionally stalked. And those victims who were stalked with technology experienced more severe stalking than those cyberstalked or traditionally stalked. And generally, regardless of stalking type, victims of intimate partner stalking experienced more stalking behaviors, more severe stalking, more emotions and fears related to their victimization, and engaged in more protective behavior with most significant associations among victims of traditional stalking. The next chapter uses multivariate analysis to examine seriousness of stalking, severity of stalking, and whether victims defined behaviors as stalking.

CHAPTER SEVEN: MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES EXAMINING SERIOUSNESS AND SEVERITY OF STALKING AND WHETHER VICTIMS CONSIDERED THE UNWANTED BEHAVIORS THEY EXPERIENCED AS STALKING

The following analyses address the research questions related to whether stalking victimization varied by severity or length and frequency when looking at the victim-offender relationship and stalking type. And these analyses also address whether the victim self-defined the unwanted behaviors they experienced as stalking when examining the victim-offender relationship and stalking type.

Previous research has attempted to quantify seriousness of stalking victimization using measures related to frequency, duration, and severity of stalking behaviors (Nobles et al., 2009). Specifically, these researchers quantified seriousness by using the weighted frequency of the more severe stalking behaviors (i.e. followed or spied on, stood outside home, showed up at places, and vandalized or destroyed property – these were more heavily weighted), the weighted frequency of the less severe behaviors (e.g. sent unsolicited letters, made unwanted phone calls), and the duration of the episode (Nobles et al., 2009). The current study had the benefit of having a measure that combines frequency with stalking behaviors, that is, the frequency of stalking was asked for each behavior (i.e. behavior occurred never, once, more than once). Unfortunately, the data used for the current research study measured stalking behaviors and frequency separately. That is, respondents were asked if they had ever experienced certain unwanted behaviors, and if they qualified they were screened into the SVS as previously discussed. From there, frequency was measured by asking the respondents how often the unwanted contacts or behaviors (as a total group) had occurred. Other research has attempted to quantify the severity of stalking by

using a composite score of stalking behaviors experienced again by frequency (i.e. never, once, rarely, sometimes, often), that is suggesting that those victims who had higher scores experienced more behaviors at a greater frequency (Melton, 2007b). The present research intends to try to get at both seriousness and severity of stalking victimization using the measures which are available.

Seriousness of stalking was computed using variables measuring the frequency and duration of stalking (see Chapter 4 for details on the specific measures). The response categories for the variable frequency of stalking ranged from once or twice a year to at least once a day (leaving out the "no set pattern or sporadically" category). And duration was measured with the question of how long the respondent realized the behaviors were happening, which was coded into years with a range of less than one year to 50 years. In order to measure seriousness of stalking, a new variable was created multiplying frequency times duration with a range of 0 to 200 with a higher score indicating much more frequent stalking over a longer period of time.

Severity of stalking was measured using the stalking behaviors, threats, and attacks experienced by the victims. The decision was made based on previous research to use only the most severe behaviors among all stalking behaviors, which were considered following or spying, waiting for victim, and showing up at places (Nobles et al., 2009). All threats and attacks or attempted attacks on either the victim or others were considered severe actions. A composite score for stalking severity was created by summing the responses to the above-mentioned variables (severe stalking behaviors, threats and attacks – 23 measures in all) with a range of 0 to 18 with a higher score indicating experiencing more of the severe stalking actions.

Linear and logistic regression analyses were conducted to predict seriousness of stalking victimization, severity of stalking victimization, and whether or not victims defined the behaviors experienced as stalking. To be consistent with previous analysis, these analyses were only conducted on the sample of stalking victims. Regarding relationship status, the sample size for respondents who were widowed was very small, and they did not logically belong in any of the other relationship status categories. Therefore, for all further multivariate analysis, the decision was made to exclude the respondents who were widowed as meaningful analysis could not be completed. Multicollinearity diagnostics were conducted for all variables and no multicollinearity issues were revealed in any of the models. All of the models in the analyses were significant.

Predicting Seriousness of Stalking Victimization

A multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to test the effects of sociodemographics, other victimization experienced by stalking victims, and the victim-offender relationship on seriousness of stalking. Other victimization was recoded to (1) victim of other crime or (0) not a victim of other crime using the household-level break in, identity theft, and vandalism, and the person-level theft, attacks, and rape variables. The results are presented in Table 36. Age, race/ethnicity (other, non-Hispanic), relationship status (divorced/separated), and victim-offender relationship were significant. Age is positively associated with a greater seriousness of stalking experienced by victims; that is, those who are older experienced stalking more frequently and for a longer duration (β=.22, $p<.05$). Other, non-Hispanic stalking victims were more likely than white, non-Hispanic victims to have scored higher on the seriousness of stalking measure (β=.16, $p<.001$). Being divorced or separated compared to being married was

associated with lower levels of seriousness of stalking (β=-.13, p<.05). And being stalked by an intimate partner was associated with significantly higher levels of seriousness (β=.14, p<.01). The R^2 value indicates that the independent variables explain about 7% of the variance in seriousness of stalking.

Table 36: OLS Regression Coefficients Predicting Seriousness of Stalking by Sociodemographics, Other Victimization, and Victim-Offender Relationship

Variable	B	SE	β
Women	1.51	1.25	0.06
Age	0.20	0.05	0.22***
Black, Non-Hispanic[a]	-1.09	1.72	-0.03
Other, Non-Hispanic[a]	8.49	2.59	0.16***
Hispanic[a]	-0.36	2.02	-0.01
Divorced/Separated[b]	-3.21	1.52	-0.13*
Never Married[b]	-1.66	1.47	-0.07
Education	-0.31	0.40	-0.04
Household Income	-0.16	0.29	-0.03
Other Victimization	1.56	1.10	0.07
IP Stalking Offender	3.36	1.22	0.14**
Constant	-2.11		
F	4.02***		
Adjusted R^2	0.07		
N	432		

[a] Compared to White, Non-Hispanic. [b] Compared to married.
* p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

A multiple linear regression analysis was used to estimate the effects of sociodemographics, other victimization, and stalking type on seriousness of stalking. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 37. Only two variables were significant in this model. Stalking type was not significant in this model. Age was again significantly and positively associated with higher scores on the seriousness of stalking scale (β=.20, p<.001). Other, non-Hispanic stalking victims had significantly higher scores on the seriousness of stalking scale compared to white, non-Hispanic stalking victims (β=.14, p<.01). The R^2 value indicates that the independent variables explain about 5% of the variance in the seriousness of stalking experienced.

Table 37: OLS Regression Coefficients Predicting Seriousness of Stalking by Sociodemographics, Other Victimization, and Stalking Type

Variable	B	SE	β
Women	1.46	1.20	0.06
Age	0.17	0.05	0.20***
Black, Non-Hispanic[a]	-1.04	1.67	-0.03
Other, Non-Hispanic[a]	7.34	2.44	0.14**
Hispanic[a]	-0.46	1.96	-0.01
Divorced/Separated[b]	-1.69	1.41	-0.07
Never Married[b]	-1.33	1.42	-0.06
Education	-0.36	0.40	-0.05
Household Income	-0.08	0.28	-0.02
Other Victimization	1.77	1.07	0.08
Cyberstalked[c]	0.49	1.41	0.02
Stalked with Technology[c]	1.94	2.43	0.04
Constant	-0.97		
F	3.03***		
Adjusted R^2	0.05		
N	454		

[a] Compared to White, Non-Hispanic. [b] Compared to married. [c] Compared to Traditionally Stalked. * p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Multiple linear regression analyses were conducted to predict the seriousness of stalking by sociodemographics, other victimization, and stalking type by victim-offender relationship. In order to make comparisons of stalking type by victim-offender relationship as in previous analyses, two models were estimated selecting for IP stalking victims (Model 1) and non-IP stalking victims (Model 2). The results of the analyses are presented in Table 38. Age was significant in both models. And race/ethnicity (other, non-Hispanic) and relationship status (divorced/separated) were significant in the non-IP stalking model. Among both IP stalking and non-IP stalking, victims who were older were significantly more likely to have experienced greater seriousness of stalking (β=.54, $p<.001$ and β=.21, $p<.01$, respectively). Among IP stalking victims, other non-Hispanic victims had experienced greater seriousness of stalking than white, non-Hispanic victims (β=.21, $p<.001$). Finally, stalking type again was not significant in predicting seriousness of stalking in either model. The R^2 values indicates that the variables in the model explain about 14% of the variance in seriousness of stalking among IP stalking victims, and about 7% of the variance in seriousness of stalking among non-IP victims.

Table 38: OLS Regression Coefficients Predicting Seriousness of Stalking by Sociodemographics, Other Victimization, and Stalking Type and Victim-Offender Relationship

	IP Stalking			Non-IP Stalking		
Variable	B	SE	β	B	SE	β
Women	1.11	1.46	0.06	1.94	1.77	0.06
Age	0.38	0.08	0.54***	0.19	0.06	0.21**
Black, Non-Hispanic[a]	-1.44	1.88	-0.07	-0.41	2.57	-0.01
Other, Non-Hispanic[a]	-2.96	4.21	-0.06	11.98	3.33	0.21***
Hispanic[a]	2.30	2.52	0.10	-1.24	2.78	-0.03
Divorced/Separated[b]	-2.67	1.83	-0.18	-4.25	2.17	-0.14
Never Married[b]	0.08	2.07	0.01	-1.24	1.98	-0.05
Education	-0.29	0.49	-0.06	-0.65	0.59	-0.07
Household Income	-0.46	0.33	-0.13	0.05	0.42	0.01
Other Victimization	-0.13	1.27	-0.01	2.27	1.59	0.08
Cyberstalked[c]	-1.06	1.60	-0.06	1.47	2.22	0.04
Stalked with Technology[c]	0.50	3.13	0.01	3.25	3.50	0.06
Constant	-3.10			-2.96		
F	2.78**			2.67**		
Adjusted R^2	0.14			0.07		
N	135			283		

[a] Compared to White, Non-Hispanic. [b] Compared to married. [c] Compared to Traditionally Stalked. * p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Predicting Severity of Stalking Victimization

Multiple linear regression analyses were used to estimate the effects of sociodemographics, other victimization, and victim-offender relationship on the severity of stalking experienced. The results are presented in Table 39. Age, relationship status (divorced/separated), other victimization, and victim-offender relationship were all significant. Age of stalking victims was significantly associated with lower levels of severity of stalking (β=-.13, p<.01). Being divorced or separated compared to being married was associated with

significantly greater severity of stalking experienced (β=.62, p<.05). It is possible that this results from stalking by former partners; however, these analyses were limited by the data and it is not known for sure. Stalking victims who are also victims of other crimes were significantly more likely than those who were not victims of any other crimes to have experienced a greater severity of stalking (β=.19, p<.001). And those who were stalked by an IP experienced significantly greater severity of stalking than those who were stalked by a non-IP (β=.15, p<.001). The R^2 value indicates that these independent variables account for about 13% of the variance in severity of stalking.

Table 39: OLS Regression Coefficients Predicting Severity of Stalking by Sociodemographics, Other Victimization, and Victim-Offender Relationship

Variable	B	SE	β
Women	-0.28	0.21	-0.05
Age	-0.02	0.01	-0.13**
Black, Non-Hispanic[a]	0.13	0.31	0.02
Other, Non-Hispanic[a]	0.43	0.44	0.04
Hispanic[a]	0.40	0.35	0.05
Divorced/Separated[b]	0.62	0.26	0.13*
Never Married[b]	-0.06	0.25	-0.01
Education	-0.11	0.07	-0.07
Household Income	-0.10	0.05	-0.09
Other Victimization	0.90	0.19	0.19***
IP Stalking Offender	0.78	0.21	0.15***
Constant	3.38		
F	8.99***		
Adjusted R^2	0.13		
N	597		

[a] Compared to White, Non-Hispanic. [b] Compared to married.
* p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

A multiple linear regression analysis was conducted predicting severity of stalking by sociodemographics, other victimization, and stalking type. The results are presented in Table 40. A total of four independent variables were significant. Age was significantly and negatively associated with severity of stalking; that is, older victims experienced lower levels of severity (β=-.16, p<.001). Those who were divorced or separated experienced greater levels of severity compared to those who were married (β=.17, p<.001). Education was significantly associated with lower levels of severity (β=-.11, p<.01). Stalking victims who were victims of other crimes experienced a greater severity of stalking than those who were not victims of any other crime (β=.17, p<.001). And those who were stalked with technology experienced significantly greater severity of stalking compared to those who were traditionally stalked (β=.16, p<.001). Cyberstalking was not significantly associated with stalking severity. The R^2 value indicates that this model accounts for about 13% of the variance in severity of stalking.

Table 40: OLS Regression Coefficients Predicting Severity of Stalking by Sociodemographics, Other Victimization, and Stalking Type

Variable	B	SE	β
Women	-0.23	0.20	-0.04
Age	-0.03	0.01	-0.16***
Black, Non-Hispanic[a]	0.16	0.29	0.02
Other, Non-Hispanic[a]	0.44	0.40	0.04
Hispanic[a]	0.42	0.33	0.05
Divorced/Separated[b]	0.81	0.23	0.17***
Never Married[b]	0.10	0.23	0.02
Education	-0.17	0.06	-0.11**
Household Income	-0.07	0.05	-0.06
Other Victimization	0.78	0.17	0.17***
Cyberstalked[c]	0.13	0.23	0.02
Stalked with Technology[c]	1.70	0.41	0.16***
Constant	3.44		
F	8.80***		
Adjusted R^2	0.13		
N	633		

[a] Compared to White, Non-Hispanic. [b] Compared to married. [c] Compared to Traditionally Stalked. * p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Two multiple linear regression models were conducted to test the effects of sociodemographics, other victimization, and stalking type by victim-offender relationship on the severity of stalking. The results of the analyses are presented in Table 41. Among IP stalking, age, relationship status (divorced/separated), other victimization, and stalking type (with technology) were significant. And among non-IP stalking, household income, other victimization, and stalking type (with technology) were significant. Among IP stalking victims, age was associated with lower levels of severity of stalking (β=-.23, p<.05). And divorced or separated victims of IP stalking experienced significantly greater levels of severity of stalking than those who were married (β=.29, p<.01). Among non-IP stalking victims, education was

associated with lower levels of severity of stalking (β=-.14, $p<.05$). Among both IP and non-IP stalking victims, those who were victims of other crimes experienced significantly greater levels of severity of stalking compared to those who were not victims of any other crimes (β=.19, $p<.01$ and β=.17, $p<.001$, respectively). And among both IP and non-IP stalking victims, those who were stalked with technology were significantly more likely than those traditionally stalked to have experienced greater levels of severity of stalking (β=.20, $p<.01$ and β=.17, $p<.001$, respectively). And again, cyberstalking was not significantly associated with severity of stalking in either of the models. The R^2 values indicate that the variables in these models account for about 13% of the variance in severity among IP stalking victims and 12% of the variance in severity among non-IP stalking victims.

Table 41: OLS Regression Coefficients Predicting Severity of Stalking by Sociodemographics, Other Victimization, and Stalking Type and Victim-Offender Relationship

	IP Stalking			Non-IP Stalking		
Variable	B	SE	β	B	SE	β
Women	-0.32	0.40	-0.06	-0.17	0.25	-0.03
Age	-0.05	0.02	-0.23*	-0.12	0.01	-0.10
Black, Non-Hispanic[a]	0.85	0.54	0.12	-0.16	0.37	-0.02
Other, Non-Hispanic[a]	-0.96	1.05	-0.07	0.87	0.47	0.09
Hispanic[a]	0.20	0.66	0.02	0.37	0.39	0.05
Divorced/Separated[b]	1.40	0.51	0.29**	0.14	0.29	0.03
Never Married[b]	0.06	0.57	0.01	0.01	0.27	0.00
Education	-0.22	0.13	-0.13	-0.16	0.08	-0.11*
Household Income	-0.01	0.09	-0.01	-0.14	0.06	-0.14*
Other Victimization	0.93	0.34	0.19**	0.75	0.22	0.17***
Cyberstalked[c]	-0.13	0.42	-0.02	0.09	0.30	0.02
Stalked with Technology[c]	2.45	0.89	0.20**	1.65	0.48	0.17***
Constant	4.46			3.33		
F	3.34***			5.30***		
Adjusted R^2	0.13			0.12		
N	184			397		

[a] Compared to White, Non-Hispanic. [b] Compared to married. [c] Compared to Traditionally Stalked. * p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Predicting If Victim Defined Unwanted Behaviors They Experienced as Stalking

Logistic regression analysis was conducted to predict whether or not victims define the unwanted behaviors they experienced as stalking. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 42. Only race/ethnicity (black, non-Hispanic and other, non-Hispanic) was significant. Both black and other, non-Hispanics had significantly higher odds of defining the unwanted behaviors they experienced as stalking than white, non-Hispanics (OR=1.83 and OR=3.07, respectively). The victim-offender relationship was not significantly associated with whether or not victims define the unwanted behaviors as stalking. The pseudo R^2 value indicates that the

variables in this model account for about 4% of the variance in whether stalking victims defined the behaviors as stalking.

Table 42: Logistic Regression Coefficients Predicting If Victim Defined Behaviors as Stalking by Sociodemographics, Other Victimization, and Victim-Offender Relationship

Variable	B	SE	Exp(B)
Women	0.31	0.20	1.36
Age	-0.01	0.01	0.99
Black, Non-Hispanic[a]	0.61*	0.30	1.83
Other, Non-Hispanic[a]	1.22*	0.49	3.07
Hispanic[a]	0.41	0.33	1.51
Divorced/Separated[b]	0.18	0.24	1.20
Never Married[b]	0.29	0.23	1.34
Education	-0.03	0.06	0.98
Household Income	0.01	0.05	1.01
Other Victimization	0.25	0.18	1.28
IP Stalking Offender	0.27	0.20	1.31
Constant	-0.28		
Chi-square	24.31*		
-2 log likelihood	774.71		
Cox & Snell R^2	0.04		
N	580		

[a] Compared to White, Non-Hispanic. [b] Compared to married.
* p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

A logistic regression model was estimated to assess the effects of sociodemographics, other victimization, and stalking type on whether or not the victim defined the unwanted behaviors as stalking. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 43. Race/ethnicity (black and other, non-Hispanic) and stalking type (cyberstalking and stalking with technology) were significant. Both black and other, non-Hispanic stalking victims had significantly higher

odds than white, non-Hispanics of defining the behaviors they experienced as stalking (OR=1.97 and OR=3.26, respectively). And those victims who were cyberstalked and stalked with technology had significantly higher odds of defining the behaviors they experienced as stalking than those who were traditionally stalked (OR=2.14 and OR=6.34, respectively). The pseudo R^2 value indicates that the independent variables in this analysis account for about 8% of the variance in whether stalking victims defined the unwanted behaviors as stalking.

Table 43: Logistic Regression Coefficients Predicting If Victim Defined Behaviors as Stalking by Sociodemographics, Other Victimization, and Stalking Type

Variable	B	SE	Exp(B)
Women	0.37	0.20	1.45
Age	-0.01	0.01	0.99
Black, Non-Hispanic[a]	0.68*	0.29	1.97
Other, Non-Hispanic[a]	1.18**	0.46	3.26
Hispanic[a]	0.44	0.32	1.56
Divorced/Separated[b]	0.23	0.23	1.26
Never Married[b]	0.38	0.23	1.47
Education	-0.08	0.06	0.93
Household Income	-0.00	0.05	0.99
Other Victimization	0.20	0.18	1.22
Cyberstalked[c]	0.76***	0.23	2.14
Stalked with Technology[c]	1.85***	0.51	6.35
Constant	-0.37		
Chi-square	49.89***		
-2 log likelihood	799.09		
Cox & Snell R^2	0.08		
N	615		

[a] Compared to White, Non-Hispanic. [b] Compared to married. [c] Compared to Traditionally Stalked. * p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Logistic regression models were conducted predicting whether or not victims define the behaviors they experienced as stalking by sociodemographics, other victimization, and stalking type by victim-offender relationship. The analysis conducted selecting only for victims of IP stalking revealed problems with the sample size, specifically when examining stalked with technology as an independent variable. This model was not appropriate to interpret, and therefore is not shown in the table. The results of the logistic regression analysis among victims of non-IP stalking are shown in Table 44. Race/ethnicity (other, non-Hispanic) and stalking type were significantly associated with the odds of defining behaviors as stalking. Among non-IP stalking victims, other, non-Hispanics had a significantly higher odds of defining the behaviors as stalking than white, non-Hispanics (OR=3.33). And those victims who were cyberstalked by a non-IP and stalked with technology by a non-IP had significantly higher odds of defining the behaviors as stalking compared to those who were traditionally stalked by a non-IP (OR=2.12 and OR=3.94, respectively). The pseudo R^2 value suggests that the variables in the model can explain about 7% of the variance in whether victims define the unwanted behaviors as stalking.

Table 44: Logistic Regression Coefficients Predicting If Victim Defined Behaviors as Stalking by Sociodemographics, Other Victimization, and Stalking Type and Victim-Offender Relationship

	Non-IP Stalking		
Variable	B	SE	Exp(B)
Women	0.24	0.25	1.28
Age	-0.00	0.01	0.99
Black, Non-Hispanic[a]	0.66	0.39	1.94
Other, Non-Hispanic[a]	1.20*	0.55	3.33
Hispanic[a]	0.34	0.39	1.41
Divorced/Separated[b]	0.19	0.30	1.21
Never Married[b]	0.26	0.28	1.30
Education	-0.06	0.06	0.99
Household Income	-0.02	0.06	0.98
Other Victimization	0.26	0.22	1.29
Cyberstalked[c]	0.76*	0.31	2.12
Stalked with Technology[c]	1.37*	0.55	3.94
Constant	-0.31		
Chi-square	25.61*		
-2 log likelihood	506.21		
Cox & Snell R^2	0.07		
N	384		

[a] Compared to White, Non-Hispanic. [b] Compared to married. [c] Compared to Traditionally Stalked. * p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

CHAPTER EIGHT: OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this research was to further expand the empirical knowledge and understanding of stalking victimization by examining stalking and its victims. Specifically, this study set out to address demographic differences, differences in severity, length and frequency of stalking, victim reactions and responses to and effects of stalking by stalking type and victim-offender relationship. This was completed by making comparisons using the appropriate statistical analyses. Additionally, comparisons were made at the multivariate level. These analyses were limited due to sample size and the nature of the sample. Because this is a victim sample, this research was unable to predict stalking victimization. This chapter serves as an overview of the findings as they relate to the research questions that were proposed, and begins with a general discussion of differences found among stalking and harassment victims.

Stalking and Harassment

Initial comparisons were made between stalking and harassment victims. By definition, harassment victims were not attacked or threatened nor were their friends, family, or pets; and they were not fearful for their own or family member's safety (Baum et al., 2009). Females were more likely than males to have been stalked. And females and males appear to have been equally likely to have experienced harassment. There was a greater portion of harassment victims who were married compared to stalking victims. Age, race and ethnicity, educational attainment, and household income distributions were similar for both stalking and harassment victims. Stalking victims were three times as likely to have experienced the more severe stalking behaviors (i.e. following or spying, waiting for victim, showing up at places). And stalking

victims were more likely to have experienced stalking with technology, and both property crimes and identity theft committed against them by their stalker. More stalking victims than harassment victims experienced the unwanted behaviors for more than one year and at least once per week. Stalking victims expressed a greater variety of emotions (e.g. depressed, helpless) as their victimization began and progressed. And stalking victims engaged in a greater number of protective and help-seeking actions, which seems appropriate as they appeared to be affected more by their victimization. In general and as expected, stalking victims experienced more types of unwanted behaviors and at a more serious level (i.e. longer duration, more frequent).

How Does Intimate and Nonintimate Stalking Differ?

This research looked at differences between intimate and nonintimate stalking by examining demographic differences, severity and seriousness of stalking experienced, victim responses and reactions to their victimization, and consequences of stalking victimization. Demographically, in this sample, victims of intimate and nonintimate stalking are quite similar with two exceptions. Those victims who were stalked by intimate partners were significantly younger than those who were stalked by nonintimate partners. Victims of intimate partner stalking were also more likely to have been divorced than victims of nonintimate partner stalking. And victims of nonintimate partner stalking were significantly more likely to be married than victims of intimate partner stalking.

The characteristics of stalking varied by the victim-offender relationship as well. Victims of intimate partner stalking experienced a greater variety of types of stalking behaviors. Specifically, victims of intimate partner stalking were more likely than victims of nonintimate partner stalking to have experienced unwanted phone calls and messages, being followed or

spied on, and having the offender show up at places where he/she did not belong. When examining seriousness of stalking looking at duration and frequency, victims stalked by intimate partners experienced the stalking for a longer duration of time. And, when seriousness of stalking was examined at a multivariate level controlling for other factors, victims of intimate partner stalking were found to have experienced greater seriousness of stalking (longer duration and frequency) than victims of nonintimate partner stalking. Further, victims of intimate partner stalking were more likely than victims of nonintimate stalking to have been attacked by their stalker, sustained injuries in attacks, experienced other crimes committed against them by their stalker, and received threats by their stalker. And when controlling for other factors, intimate partner stalking victims experienced significantly greater severity of stalking when compared to nonintimate partner stalking victims. In addition, when controlling for other factors including victim-offender relationship, stalking victims who suffered other types of victimization experienced a greater severity of stalking victimization.

With regard to how the victims felt in response to their victimization, intimate and nonintimate stalking victims responded differently. Victims of intimate partner stalking were more likely than victims of nonintimate stalking to have felt the stalker began targeting them because of the perpetrator's characteristics (e.g. mentally ill or emotionally unstable), for control, and for retaliation, anger, or spite. Intimate partner stalking victims were more likely than nonintimate stalking victims to have felt frightened, depressed, helpless, and sick when the stalking began; and they were more likely to have continued to feel depressed, helpless, and sick as the behaviors progressed. And victims of intimate partner stalking were more likely than victims of nonintimate partner stalking to have expressed their worst fear as a result of the

unwanted behaviors as physical harm, harm to their child, and loss of freedom. Victims of intimate partner stalking were also more likely to have defined the behaviors as stalking; however, this did not remain significant when controlling for other factors.

Victims of intimate and nonintimate partner stalking responded differently to their victimization. Victims of intimate partner stalking were significantly more likely than victims of nonintimate partner stalking to have engaged in more protective and help seeking actions. Further, a higher portion of intimate partner stalking victims had lost their jobs when compared to nonintimate stalking victims (although the difference was not significant). And victims of intimate partner stalking had lost significantly more time from work due to their victimization when compared to victims of nonintimate partner stalking.

Overall, it appears that intimate partner stalking and nonintimate partner stalking differ in a multitude of ways. Those who are stalked by intimate partners are more likely to have been divorced or separated from their partner (possibly their stalker). Intimate partner stalking victims experienced higher levels of seriousness and greater severity of stalking. And intimate partner stalking victims expressed significantly more emotions and fear than nonintimate partner stalking victims. Finally, victims who were stalked by intimate partners were more likely to have engaged in protective actions and sought help, but were also more likely to have faced negative consequences as a result of their stalking victimization.

How Do Cyberstalking, Stalking with Technology and Traditional Stalking Differ?

This research examined differences between stalking types by analyzing demographic differences, severity and seriousness of stalking experienced, victim responses and reactions to their victimization, and consequences of stalking victimization. Demographically there are a few

differences among victims who were cyberstalked, stalked with technology, and traditionally stalked. Overall, most victims were female, but those victims who were traditionally stalked were more likely to have been female than those who were cyberstalked and stalked with technology. Victims of cyberstalking were more likely to be never married and have a higher education compared to those who were stalked with technology and traditionally stalked. And victims of stalking with technology were more likely to be divorced. Finally, victims of cyberstalking had a greater income than victims of traditional stalking.

Victims of the three stalking types also experienced different stalking characteristics. Those who were cyberstalked experienced a greater number of communication stalking behaviors (e.g. receiving unwanted communication). And those who were stalked with technology were more likely to have experienced more of the severe or physical type of stalking behaviors (i.e. following or spying). In general, victims who were stalked with technology were more likely than both those who were cyberstalked and traditionally stalked to have experienced other crimes committed against them by their stalker, attacks on others by their stalker, and received more threats against both others and themselves. Those stalked by technology experienced a greater severity of stalking victimization. Victims of other types of victimization (other than stalking) also experienced a greater severity of stalking. Also, those stalked by technology experienced a higher frequency of stalking than those traditionally stalked; and were more likely to report that the stalking was still ongoing than those cyberstalked and traditionally stalked.

Responses to victimization varied by stalking type as well. Those who were cyberstalked were more likely than those who were stalked with technology and traditionally stalked to have

felt that the stalking began because of how the perpetrator felt about the victim (e.g. liked the victim) and for control reasons. Victims of traditional stalking were less likely than victims of cyberstalking and stalking with technology to have felt annoyed or angry when the stalking began. And victims of stalking with technology were more likely than victims of cyberstalking and traditional stalking to have felt helpless when the stalking began and depressed, helpless, and sick when the stalking progressed. Cyberstalking victims were more likely than traditional and stalking with technology victims to express a fear of not knowing what would happen next. Those stalked with technology were more likely than those cyberstalked and traditionally stalked to have reported their worst fear as losing their mind and fear of physical harm. And, both victims who were cyberstalked and stalked with technology were more likely than those traditionally stalked to have defined the unwanted behaviors as stalking.

Finally, reactions to and consequences of stalking victimization differed by stalking type. Victims of both cyberstalking and stalking with technology were more likely than victim of traditional stalking to have engaged in protective actions and sought help. Some specifics include, victims of cyberstalking were more likely than victims of traditional stalking to have changed their personal information. And victims of stalking with technology were more likely than victims of cyberstalking and traditional stalking to have engaged in more active protective actions, such as getting a weapon. Additionally, those stalked with technology were more likely than all others to have moved and lost time from work due to their victimization.

Overall, it appears that characteristics of stalking, responses, and reactions to stalking differ by stalking type. Those who were cyberstalked and stalked with technology experienced a greater variety of stalking behaviors, expressed more emotions toward their victimization, were

more likely to define the behaviors as stalking, and took more actions toward stopping their victimization or protecting themselves. Further, it appears that it was important to examine cyberstalking and stalking with technology separately as they do appear to have different characteristics overall. Those who were stalked with technology appear to have experienced a greater severity of stalking, more negative responses to their victimization (e.g. feeling helpless), and more negative consequences of their victimization.

When Comparing Stalking Types, Does the Victim-Offender Relationship Matter?

In addition to exploring differences between stalking types, this research also considered whether the victim-offender relationship mattered as well when looking at the three stalking types. Again, this was completed by analyzing differences in stalking type separately by intimate and nonintimate partner victim-offender relationship among demographics, severity and seriousness of stalking experienced, victim responses and reactions to their victimization, and consequences of stalking victimization. Comparisons were made within each stalking type by victim-offender relationship (i.e. cyberstalking by IP versus cyberstalking by non-IP).

The nature of stalking varied among stalking types when examining the victim-offender relationship. Victims who were traditionally stalked by an IP experienced more types of stalking behaviors than those who were traditionally stalked by a non-IP. Victims of cyberstalking by an IP experienced more crimes and attacks committed against them by their stalker than victims of cyberstalking by a non-IP. Those who were traditionally stalked by an IP were more likely than those traditionally stalked by a non-IP to have experienced more crimes and attacks committed against them by their stalker, and received more threats against others and themselves. Overall, when controlling for other factors, among both victims of IP and non-IP stalking those who were

stalked with technology experienced a greater level of severity of stalking than those who were traditionally stalked. And other victimization was positively associated with severity of stalking experienced by both intimate and nonintimate partners. Finally, those victims traditionally stalked by an IP experienced a longer duration of stalking than those traditionally stalked by a non-IP.

Responses to stalking victimization by type and victim-offender relationship were different as well. Victims of stalking by an IP among all types (cyber, technology, traditional) were more likely than victims of stalking by a non-IP to feel that the perpetrator began the stalking in order to control them. Those traditionally stalked by an IP were more likely than those traditionally stalked by a non-IP to have felt that the perpetrator began stalking because of his/her characteristics (e.g. substance abuser). Victims of traditional stalking by an IP were more likely than victims of traditional stalking by a non-IP to have expressed feeling frightened, depressed and sick when the stalking began, and depressed, helpless, and sick when the stalking progressed. And victims of traditional stalking by an IP were more likely than victims of traditional stalking by a non-IP to have reported their worst fears as harm to their child, loss of freedom, and physical harm to themselves.

Lastly, reaction to and consequences of stalking were different among stalking types by victim-offender relationship. Victims of both cyberstalking and traditional stalking by an IP were more likely than those cyberstalked and traditionally stalked by a non-IP to have engaged in protective actions and sought help. Additionally, those cyberstalked by an IP were more likely than those cyberstalked by a non-IP to have lost time from work in order to get a protection order or go to court. And those traditionally stalked by an IP were significantly more

likely than those traditionally stalked by a non-IP to have moved or lost time from work due to their stalking victimization.

In general, there are differences among stalking types when examining the victim-offender relationship. The majority of the differences are when comparing those traditionally stalked by an IP to those traditionally stalked by a non-IP. This may be a reflection of the smaller sample size in the other four categories. The amount of respondents who were cyberstalked and stalked with technology was small, and splitting this by victim-offender relationship further reduces the sample size. It does appear that the differences that were found here were similar to those found just examining the victim-offender relationship. That is, those stalked by an IP experienced more types of behaviors, more crimes and attacks committed against them by their stalker, more threats, more emotions and reactions, and more negative consequences.

Chapter Summary

This chapter provided an overview of the research findings with relation to the research questions. The following is a final overview of the main research outcomes.

How does intimate and nonintimate stalking differ? Stalking by victim-offender relationship differed on:

- Age and relationship status
- Types of stalking behaviors experience
- Seriousness and severity of stalking
- Reasons victim felt that the perpetrator began stalking

- Emotions and fears the victim felt due to their victimization
- Reactions to and consequences of stalking victimization

How do cyberstalking, stalking with technology and traditional stalking differ? These stalking types differed on:

- Gender, relationship status, educational attainment, and income
- Types of stalking behaviors experienced
- Severity of stalking
- Reasons victim felt that the perpetrator began stalking
- Emotions and fears the victim felt due to their victimization
- Reactions to and consequences of stalking victimization

And when comparing stalking types, does the victim-offender relationship matter? Yes, the victim-offender relationship does matter. Most of the differences lie between traditional stalking by an IP and by a non-IP, but this is probably a reflection of the small sample size in the cyberstalking and stalking with technology categories. Differences were found among:

- Types of stalking behaviors experienced
- Severity of stalking
- Reasons victim felt that the perpetrator began stalking
- Emotions and fears the victim felt due to their victimization
- Reactions to and consequences of stalking victimization

CHAPTER NINE: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The goal of this research was to add to the existing research by examining both intimate and nonintimate stalking and the use of technology to stalk. To accomplish this, the current research examined differences among intimate and nonintimate stalking, stalking types (cyberstalking, stalking with technology, and traditional stalking), and stalking types by the victim-offender relationship. The data used were the most recent national data on stalking and the first national data to examine cyberstalking and electronic monitoring. This chapter includes a discussion of what was found and how it compared to previous research, limitations of the current research, suggestions for future research, and policy implications.

While direct comparison cannot be made due to methodological differences, it is important to note that many findings from these data are similar to findings from the NVAW Survey (the first national survey to include stalking victimization). Women were the primary victims and males were the primary stalkers in both samples (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998b). The majority of victims in both samples knew their stalker (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998b). Victims in both samples were likely to feel that the desire to control them motivated their stalker to begin stalking them (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998b). Further differences among intimate partner stalking and nonintimate partner stalking emerged in both and are discussed in more detail below.

Intimate and Nonintimate Stalking

This research intended to add to the existing research discussion of differences between intimate and nonintimate stalking. Specifically, differences in unwanted behaviors experienced, consequences, reactions, and responses to victimization were examined. There has been a call

for more research with a focus on intimate partner stalking and comparisons of intimate partner stalking to nonintimate partner stalking. Additionally, there has been limited research on how victims feel in response to their stalking victimization. The present research has provided findings to begin expanding our knowledge of intimate partner stalking using a national level data set.

Consistent with previous research, the majority of intimate partner stalking victims were female with male offenders. Victims who were stalked by their current or former intimate partner were more likely than victims who were stalked by a nonintimate partner to have experienced more serious and severe stalking, more negative consequences, emotions, and fears as a result of their victimization, and to have reacted by taking protective or help-seeking actions. Previous research has found that intimate partner stalkers will engage in a wider range of stalking behaviors for a longer duration and are more likely to threaten and engage in violence, which this research further supports (Logan et al., 2006; Melton, 2000; Sheridan & Davies, 2001; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998b; Wright et al., 1996). Interestingly, and consistent with prior research, those who were stalked by intimate partners were more likely than those stalked by nonintimate partners to have felt that their stalker began those actions in order to exert control over them (Brewster, 2003; Mechanic et al., 2000b). In addition to some of the differences between intimate and nonintimate partner stalking, this research also intended to address the nature of intimate partner stalking.

One of the debates within the literature is whether intimate partner stalking is a variant or a continuation of intimate partner violence. This research did reveal that about 40% of the stalking began while the victims were still living with their abuser. When controlling for other

factors, victims who were divorced experienced a greater severity of stalking than those who were married, perhaps suggesting that stalking either began or escalated at the dissolution of the marriage or it just continued on from an already abusive relationship. And, while limited by sample size, this research also showed that victims of intimate stalking were experiencing other victimization by intimate partners at a higher rate than other victimization by nonintimate partners. With this limited evidence, it is difficult to come to a definite conclusion based upon this research whether intimate partner stalking is either a variant or continuation of intimate partner violence. Intimate partner stalking, however, does appear to follow other characteristics of intimate partner violence more generally in which the victimization is occurring within the relationship, for motivations of control, and for more severe and longer durations of time. Overall, this research does reveal there are significant differences between intimate and nonintimate partner stalking. Those stalked by an intimate partner are at a greater risk of experiencing more serious and severe levels of stalking.

Cyberstalking, Stalking with Technology, and Traditional Stalking

This research examined differences between cyberstalking, stalking with technology, and traditional stalking. Research on cyberstalking and stalking with technology is growing, but still very new. And no prior research on cyberstalking has been done using a national sample, which the current study is able to provide. Additionally, previous research has not examined cyberstalking and stalking with technology separately at this level. Most research has examined only cyberstalking or online stalking in general. The current research provides a comparison of the two groups, in addition to a traditional stalking group. It also expands the current knowledge

on cyberstalking by providing comparisons among the three types of stalking (cyberstalking, stalking with technology, traditional stalking).

Consistent with previous research, victims of both cyberstalking and stalking with technology were most likely to be females and perpetrators were most likely to be males (D'Ovidio & Doyle, 2003; Moriarty & Freiberger, 2008; Sheridan & Grant, 2007). In addition, like other forms of stalking, victims of cyberstalking and stalking with technology are most likely to know their stalker in some way, providing support for some previous research (Alexy et al., 2005; USDOJ, 1999; USDOJ, Violence Against Women Office, 2001). Victims who were cyberstalked and stalked with technology were significantly more likely than those traditionally stalked to have defined the behaviors as stalking. This may suggest that these types of stalking or the addition of these types of stalking to other forms of stalking lead victims to identify the behaviors as stalking. Without knowing if victims were only cyberstalked or only stalked with technology (due to survey design), it is difficult to determine if it is the actual behaviors of cyberstalking and stalking with technology that cause victims to be more likely to define the behaviors as stalking. The current research showed that victims of cyberstalking and stalking with technology experienced a greater variety of behaviors, and as such it may be that the increase in the behaviors experienced caused these victims to identify the behaviors as stalking. Victims who were cyberstalked or stalked with technology were also more likely than those who were traditionally stalked to have engaged in help-seeking actions. This again suggests that these types of behaviors cause another level of reaction than only experiencing traditional stalking.

Furthermore, this research confirmed that it is, in fact, important to examine cyberstalking and stalking with technology (electronic monitoring) separately. It appears that stalking with technology is not only an extension of stalking, but perhaps a more severe level of stalking. Victims who were stalked with technology were more likely than those stalked by other methods to have experienced more severe levels of stalking. And victims stalked with technology reacted in more severe ways to the stalking, that is, they engaged in more active protective behaviors, including getting weapons. These results may be an indication that stalking with technology could be an escalation of stalking, but this conclusion cannot be entirely made with these data due to survey design as one is unable to tell if the stalking with technology came before or after other types of stalking behaviors. Overall, this research has provided a first examination of cyberstalking and stalking with technology using a national dataset that can add to the expanding knowledge on this topic. This research shows that there are significant differences between cyberstalking, stalking with technology, and traditional stalking. More specifically, those cyberstalked and stalked with technology appear to be experiencing and reacting to their stalking victimization in different, more negative, ways.

Applying Feminist Theory to Stalking

As previously mentioned, there has been limited research on the application of theory to stalking victimization. The current research proposed that a feminist perspective may fit with stalking victimization. This research has shown that stalking is a gendered crime with significantly more female victims and male perpetrators. In particular, when this research examined stalking and harassment victimization, gender victimization was almost equal among harassment victims, but three quarters of stalking victims were female. One of the main

distinctions between harassment and stalking is the induced fear experienced as a result of the victimization. When examining the gender distribution among harassment victims, the distribution was more even with women and men almost equally experiencing harassment. Yet there was a large gender distribution among stalking victims, where females were much more likely to have experienced stalking. That is, females were more likely to have experienced the induced fear that would have defined them as stalking victims. And this fear was caused, in the majority of the cases, by a male stalker who was most likely known to the victim in some capacity (i.e. intimate partner, acquaintance). And this appears to have held true for each stalking type as well as the majority of victims of all stalking types (i.e. cyberstalking, stalking with technology, and traditional stalking) were females. Interestingly, the gender disparity was larger among traditional stalking victims (about 78.8% female) than among cyberstalking and stalking with technology victims (69.0% and 64.0% respectively). While females are still the majority of victims regardless of stalking type, males were more likely to be cyberstalked and stalked with technology than traditionally stalked. In addition to gender differences, there were also differences in the perceived motivations of stalking by victim-offender relationship.

A good portion of victims reported that the felt their stalker began stalking them in order to control them. This was an especially prevalent response among those stalked by intimate partners. And this finding held regardless of stalking type, that is, victims who were stalked in any manner by an intimate partner were more likely than those stalked by a nonintimate partner to have felt the perpetrator began stalking in order to control them. This finding is consistent with intimate partner violence research that finds abusers use various methods to obtain power and control over their victims. The dynamics of intimate partner violence appear to be involved

in victims' perception of their perpetrator using stalking as a form of control. And previous stalking research has shown that stalking may in fact be a method of control and that male stalkers view it as an entitlement to control their intimate partners (Brewster, 2003; Melton, 2007a). Overall, with the gendered nature of stalking and the similarities between intimate partner stalking and intimate partner violence in general, it does appear that the feminist perspective may be a relevant perspective to consider in further research on stalking.

Limitations

This research is not without limitations. The NCVS data are considered nationally representative of the noninstitutionalized population, ages 12 and older, in the United States (Rennison & Rand, 2007). Yet, one limitation is that respondents must be members of noninstitutionalized population to be included. And further these SVS data in particular were only collected from those persons aged 18 and older. Because of the nature of the data and survey design, as it is a victimization sample, this research was unable to predict stalking victimization. There were only a small portion of respondents who were victims of either cyberstalking or stalking with technology, which limited the analysis further. This became more problematic when comparisons were made among stalking type by victim-offender relationship. In general, the analyses were limited by sample size and survey constraints. However, regardless of these limitations, this research has provided further knowledge regarding stalking victimization.

Suggestions for Future Research

This research was able to show differences among stalking types, specifically looking and cyberstalking and stalking with technology. As mentioned, the sample size was limited, and as such future research should look to increase the sample in order to further examine stalking. Specifically, a larger sample would provide more data to analyze differences among cyberstalking and stalking with technology and could also provide the opportunity to further examine the victim-offender relationship by different categories (i.e. acquaintance, co-workers, current IP versus ex-IP). In addition, technology is continuously changing, and these data were already outdated as potential methods of stalking such as texting or social networking were not included on this survey that was collected in 2006 and publicly released in 2009. Further research should look into including those types of potential methods for stalking, and should continue to follow the changing technology. The upcoming data collection effort using the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Surveillance System from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's National Center for Injury Prevention and Control (NCIPC) is promising and will likely offer some improvement for the measurement and understanding of stalking and use of technology in stalking (CDC, NCIPC, 2009; Smith & Black, 2009).

Further, as the stalking research field continues to grow, the improvement and consistency of measures used should be a goal. Previous research has measured and conceptualized stalking severity and seriousness in different manners, and the current research attempted to best examine these measures too within the constraints of the survey design. Future research should try to measure frequency and duration of each stalking behavior, rather than an overall measure for all stalking behaviors. In addition, it would be helpful to be able to identify

if victims only experienced cyberstalking or stalking with technology or if these behaviors were experienced in addition to other forms of stalking (i.e. making phone calls). This would allow further comparison of stalking type. Furthermore, it would be ideal to be able to identify which stalking behaviors came first. That is, was there an escalation of stalking and perhaps was there an escalation of violence. As suggested, stalking with technology appears to be a more severe type of stalking, and if one could estimate if it occurred before or after other behaviors were experienced, a conclusion could be made as to whether it was an escalation.

To help address and further examine the debate as to whether intimate partner stalking is a variant or continuation of intimate partner violence, one question that may be asked is when the stalking began in the relationship (before it ended, after it ended, or both). And it clearly is important to further examine how control plays a role in stalking victimization. Victims perceived control as a motivation of the perpetrator, and this is consistent with intimate partner violence in general. The dynamics of power and control should be further explored in the stalking literature.

The relation of gender and stalking should be further examined as well. While this research provides support that stalking is a gendered crime where women are more likely victims and men are offenders, some interesting differences arose when examining stalking types. The gender disparity among victims was not as great for cyberstalking and stalking with technology when compared to traditional stalking. And previous research has found that men may be more likely to have experienced cyberstalking. This gender relation among stalking types is certainly something that warrants further investigation. As research on cyberstalking and stalking with technology continues, it will be interesting to see if men may be at equal risk to these forms of

victimization or if women will continue to be most at risk. Further, when controlling for other factors, gender was not significant in predicting seriousness or severity of stalking. It appears in this sample that the victim-offender relationship and stalking type may have been more important. Research should continue to explore if gender is related to not only stalking victimization, but characteristics of stalking victimization as well.

Finally, the feminist perspective appeared to be a potential theoretical explanation for stalking victimization and should be further explored. Stalking is a gendered crime and it has similarities in dynamics of intimate partner violence, which furthers the notion that feminist theory may continue to offer an appropriate perspective. Furthermore, other theoretical explanations for stalking should be explored, including theories such as routine activities. In general, research should continue to explore with other samples the differences among intimate and nonintimate stalking and among stalking types.

Policy Implications

Stalking should be seen as a serious form of victimization that can have many negative consequences for victims. In particular, it appears that those victimized by intimate partners and those who experience stalking with technology are at a greater risk of severe levels of stalking. It is important for researchers and practitioners to use this knowledge to further our understanding of stalking and respond to help victims. In particular, victims of intimate partner violence should be screened for stalking victimization as well and safety planning should be provided (Davis et al., 2002). Intimate partner stalking may be more dangerous and research has shown that it has the potential to become lethal (Coleman, 1997; McFarlane et al., 1999, 2002). For those in victim services, stalking severity may serve as a potential lethality risk factor for

victims. It is important to see stalking as a crime of possible violence, and this and other research supports this notion (Melton, 2007a). Knowing differences between intimate and nonintimate partner stalking, and among stalking types, can help in both intervention and prevention efforts.

As this research has shown, intimate partner stalkers are more likely to have committed more severe and serious behaviors in conjunction with stalking, and hence it would seem that stronger policies to prosecute intimate partner offenders may be needed. The criminal justice system needs to respond properly with greater sentences and policies in order to prevent further stalking. In general, it remains important that the laws continue to adapt as stalking victimization has negative consequences for victims. As technology changes, so do methods for stalking, and it is important that education be provided about the safe use of technology and online tools (Southworth et al., 2007). Victim advocates and law enforcement will need to continue to stay informed about increasing technology; and new legal protections and techniques may need to be developed to address the changing face of stalking with technology (Southworth et al., 2007). Stalking is a serious crime that is continuously evolving and it is important that policies and practices continue to change alongside this crime.

The current study contributes to the existing body of research on stalking by examining intimate partner stalking, cyberstalking, and stalking with technology using national data. These data are the first to examine cyberstalking and electronic monitoring at a national level. This research has revealed that it is important to recognize differences in intimate and nonintimate partner stalking, as well as differences by stalking type. It is important to continue the research

effort on stalking and expand our knowledge about stalking in order to better help the victims of stalking.

REFERENCES

Adam, A. (2002). Cyberstalking and Internet pornography: Gender and the gaze. *Ethics and Information Technology, 4*, 133-142.

Alexy, E.M., Burgess, A.W., Baker, T., & Smoyak, S.A. (2005). Perceptions of cyberstalking among college students. *Brief Treatment and Crisis Intervention, 5*(3), 279-289.

Baum, K. (2009). Stalking victimization in the U.S.: Findings from the NCVS. Research presented at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences annual meeting in Boston, MA.

Baum, K., Catalano, S., & Rand, M. (2009). *Stalking victimization in the United States* (NCJ 224527). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Bjerregaard, B. (2000). An empirical study of stalking victimization. *Violence and Victims, 15*(4), 389-406

Bocij, P. (2003). Victims of cyberstalking: An exploratory study of harassment perpetrated via the Internet. *First Monday, 8*(10). Retrieved from http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/1086/1006.

Bocij, P. (2004). *Cyberstalking: Harassment in the Internet age and how to protect your family*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Bogard, M. (1988). Feminist perspectives on wife abuse: An introduction. In K. Yllö & M. Bogard (Eds.) *Feminist perspectives on wife abuse* (pp11-26). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Bopp, P.J. (2005). *Program against violence to women: Sexual and relationship violence at UHM findings and recommendation for the University of Hawai'i*. (Grant No. 2002-WA-BX-0002). Washington, D.C.: Violence Against Women Office, U.S. Department of Justice.

Brewster, M.P. (1999). *Exploration of the experiences and needs of former intimate stalking victims*. (NCJ No. 175475). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Brewster, M.P. (2002). Trauma symptoms of former intimate stalking victims. *Women & Criminal Justice, 13*(2/3), 141-161.

Brewster, M.P. (2003). Power and control dynamics in prestalking and stalking situations. *Journal of Family Violence, 18*(4), 207-217.

Burgess, A.W., & Baker, T. (2002). Cyberstalking. In J. C. W. Boon, & L. Sheridan (Eds.), *Stalking and psychosexual obsession: Psychological perspectives for prevention, policing, and treatment* (pp. 201-219). Chilchester: Wiley.

Burgess, A.W., Baker, T., Greening, D., Hartman, C.R., Burgess, A.G., Douglas, J.E., & Hollaran, R. (1997). Stalking behaviors within domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 12*(4), 389-403.

Coleman, F.L. (1997). Stalking behavior and the cycle of domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12*(3), 420-432.

Davis, K.E., Coker, A.L., & Sanderson, M. (2002). Physical and mental health effects of being stalked for men and women. *Violence and Victims, 17*(4), 429-443.

Davis, K.E., & Frieze, I.H. (2000). Research on stalking: What do we know and where do we go? *Violence and victims, 15*(4), 473-487.

Dennison, S.M., & Thomson, D.M. (2002). Identifying stalking: The relevance of intent in commonsense reasoning. *Law and Human Behavior, 26*(5), 543-561.

Dobash, R.E., & Dobash, R. (1979). *Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy*. New York: The Free Press.

Dubow, B. (2007). Confessions of 'Facebook stalkers.' *USA Today*. Retrieved from http://www.usatoday.com/tech/webguide/internetlife/2007-03-07-facebook-stalking_N.htm

Dye, M.L., & Davis, K.E. (2003). Stalking and psychological abuse: Common factors and relationship-specific characteristics. *Violence and Victims, 18*(2), 163-180.

Everett, A. (2004). On cyberfeminism and cyberwomanism: High-tech mediations of feminism's discontents. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 30*(1), 1278-1286.

Faulkner, W. (2001). The technology question in feminism: A view from feminist technology studies. *Women's Studies International Forum, 24*(1), 79-95.

Finn, J. (2004). A survey of online harassment at a university campus. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*(40, 468-483.

Finn, J., & Atkinson, T. (2009). Promoting the safe and strategic use of technology for victims of intimate partner violence: Evaluation of the technology safety project. *Journal of Family Violence, 24*, 53-59.

Finn, J., & Banach, M. (2000). Victimization online: The down side of seeking human services for women on the Internet. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 3*(2), 243-254.

Finkelhor, D., Mitchell, K.J., & Wolak, J. (2000). *Online victimization: A report on the nation's youth*. National Center for Missing & Exploited Children.

Fisher, B.S., Cullen, F.T., & Turner, M.G. (2000). *The sexual victimization of college women* (NCJ No. 182369). Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Justice.

Fisher, B.S., Cullen, F.T., & Turner, M.G. (2002). Being pursued: Stalking victimization in a national study of college women. *Criminology and Public Policy, 1*(2), 257-308.

Fremouw, W.J., Westrup, D., & Pennypacker, J. (1997). Stalking on campus: The prevalence and strategies for coping with stalking. *Journal of Forensic Science, 42*(4), 666-669.

Gardner, R. (2001). *Psychological Statistics Using SPSS for Windows*. Prentice Hall: Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Gregorie, T.M. (2001). Cyberstalking: Dangers on the information superhighway. National Center for Victims of Crime.

Haugaard, J.J., & Seri, L.G. (2003). Stalking and other forms of intrusive contact after the dissolution of adolescent dating or romantic relationships. *Violence and Victims, 18*(3), 279-297.

Healey, J.F. (2002). *Statistics: A Tool for Social Research,* 6th ed. Wadsworth/Thomson Learning: Belmont, CA

Jenkins, C.L. (2007). Stalkers go high tech to intimidate victims. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/04/13/AR2007041302392.html.

Jordan, C.E., Wilcox, P., & Pritchard, A.J. (2007). Stalking acknowledgement and reporting among college women experiencing intrusive behaviors: Implications for the emergence of a “classic stalking case.” *Journal of Criminal Justice, 35*, 556-569.

Karjane, H.M., Fisher, B.S., & Cullen, F.T. (2002). *Campus sexual assault: How America's institutions of higher education respond*. Final report. (NIJ Grant #1999-WA-VX-0008). Newton, MA: Education Development Center, Inc.

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Palarea, R. E., Cohen, J., & Rohling, M. L. (2000). Breaking up is hard to do: Unwanted pursuit behaviors following the dissolution of a romantic relationship. *Violence and Victims, 15*(1), 73-90.

Logan, T.K., & Cole, J. (2007). The impact of partner stalking on mental health and protective order outcomes over time. *Violence and Victims, 22*(5), 546-562.

Logan, T.K., Cole, J. Shannon, L., & Walker, R. (2006). *Partner stalking: How women respond, cope, and survive*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.

Logan, T.K., & Walker, R. (2009). Partner stalking: Psychological dominance or "business as usual?" *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 10*(3), 247-270.

Logan, T. K., Leukefeld, C., & Walker, B. (2000). Stalking as a variant of intimate violence: Implications from a young adult sample. *Violence and Victims, 15*(1), 91-111.

Logan, T.K., Shannon, L., Cole, J. (2007). Stalking victimization in the context of intimate partner violence. *Violence and Victims, 22*(6), 669-683.

Lenhart, A. (2009). Adults and social network websites. Pew Internet and American Life Project. Retrieved August 28, 2009 from http://www.pewinternet.org/Reports/2009/Adults-and-Social-Network-Websites.aspx.

MacKinnon, C. A. (1993). Feminism, Marxism, method, and the state: Toward a feminist jurisprudence. In P. B. Bart, & E. G. Moran (Eds.), *Violence against women: The bloody footprints* (pp. 201-227). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

McAnaney, K.G., Curliss, L.A., & Abeyta-Price, C.E. (1993). From imprudence to crime: Anti-stalking laws. *Notre Dame Law Review, 68*, 819-909.

McFarlane, J.M., Campbell, J.C., & Watson, K. (2002). Intimate partner stalking and femicide: Urgent implications for women's safety. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 20*, 51-68.

McFarlane, J.M., Campbell, J.C., Wilt, S., Sachs, C.J., Ulrich, Y., & Xu, X. (1999). Stalking and intimate partner femicide. *Homicide Studies, 3*(4), 300-316.

Mechanic, M. B., Uhlmansiek, M. H., Weaver, T. L., & Resick, P. A. (2000a). The impact of severe stalking experienced by acutely battered women: An examination of violence, psychological symptoms and strategic responding. *Violence and Victims, 15*(4), 443-458.

Mechanic, M. B., Weaver, T. L., & Resick, P. A. (2000b). Intimate partner violence and stalking behavior: Exploration of patterns and correlates in a sample of acutely battered women. *Violence and Victims, 15*(1), 55-72.

Melton, H.C. (2000). Stalking: A review of the literature and direction for the future. *Criminal Justice Review, 25*(2), 246-262.

Melton, H.C. (2007a). Closing in: Stalking in the context of intimate partner abuse. *Sociology Compass, 1/2*, 520-535

Melton, H.C. (2007b). Predicting the occurrence of stalking in relationships characterized by domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22*(1), 3-25.

Melton, H.C. (2007c). Stalking in the context of intimate partner abuse: In the victims' words. *Feminist Criminology, 2*(4), 347-363.

Mertler, C.A., & Vannatta, R.A. (2010). *Advanced and Multivariate Statistical Methods: Practical Application and Interpretation*, 4th Ed. Pyrczak Publishing: Glendale, CA.

Miller, C. (2009). High-tech stalking. *Law Enforcement Technology*, *36*(5), 56-60.

Miller, N. (2002). *Stalking laws and implementation process: A national review for policymakers and practitioners*. (NCJ No. 197066). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Moriarty, L.J. & Freiberge, K. (2008). Cyberstalking: Utilizing newspaper accounts to establish victimization patterns. *Victims and Offenders*, *3*, 131-141.

Mustaine, E.E., & Tewksbury, R. (1999). A routine activity theory explanation for women's stalking victimizations. *Violence Against Women, 5*(1), 43-62.

National Center for Victims of Crime (2007). *The model stalking code revisted: Responding to the new realities of stalking*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Victims of Crime.

National Institute of Justice (NIJ). (1996). *Domestic violence, stalking, and antistalking legislation: An annual report to Congress under the Violence Against Women Act*. (NCJ No. 160943). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Nobles, M.R., Fox, K.A., Piquero, N., & Piquero, A.R. (2009). Career dimensions of stalking Victimization and Perpetration. *Justice Quarterly*, *26*(3), 476-503.

Office of Victims of Crime (OVC). (2002). *Strengthening antistalking statutes* (NCJ No. 189192). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Ogilvie, E. (2000a). Cyberstalking. *Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice,* No. 166. Australian Institute of Criminology.

Ogilvie, E. (2000b). The internet and cyberstalking. Sydney: Australian Institutive of Criminology.

O'Neill, D. (1998). A post-structuralist review of the theorectical literature surrounding wife abuse. *Violence Against Women*, *4*(4), 457-490.

Pew Internet and American Life Project. (2009a). Demographics of Internet users. Retrieved August 28, 2009 from http://www.pewinternet.org/Trend-Data/Whos-Online.aspx.

Pew Internet and American Life Project. (2009b). Internet activities. Retrieved August 28, 2009 from http://www.pewinternet.org/Trend-Data/Online-Activites-Total.aspx.

Pew Internet and American Life Project. (2009c). Online activities, 2000-2009. Retrieved August 28, 2009 from http://www.pewinternet.org/Trend-Data/Online-Activities-20002009.aspx.

Phillips, L., Quirk, R., Rosenfeld, B., & O'Connor, M. (2004). Is it stalking? Perceptions of stalking among college undergraduates. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 31*(1), 73-96.

Rennison, C.M. & Rand, M. (2007). Introduction to the National Crime Victimization Survey. In Lynch, J.P., & Addington, L.A. (Eds.) *Understanding crime statistics: Revisiting the divergence of the NCVS and the UCR.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Roberts, K.A. (2005). Women's experience of violence during stalking by former romantic partners. *Violence Against Women, 11*(1), 89-114.

Rosser, S.V. (2005). Through the lenses of feminist theory: Focus on women and information technology. *Frontiers, 26*(1), 1-23.

Sheridan, L., Blaauw, E., & Davies, G.M. (2003). Stalking: Knowns and unknowns. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse: A Review Journal, 4*(), 148-162.

Sherdian, L. & Davies, G.M. (2001). Violence and the prior victim-stalker relationship. *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health, 11*, 102-116.

Sheridan, L., Davies, G., & Boon, J. (2001a). The course and nature of stalking: A victim perspective. *The Howard Journal, 40*(3), 215-234.

Sheridan, L., Davies, G.M., & Boon, J.C.W. (2001b). Stalking: Perceptions and prevalence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16*(2), 151-167.

Sheridan, L.P., & Grant, T. (2007). Is cyberstalking different? *Psychology, Crime, & Law, 13*(6), 627-640.

Singh, S. (2008). Anti-social networking: Learning the art of making enemies in web 2.0. *Journal of Internet Law,* 3-11

Smith, M.D. (1990). Patriarchal ideology and wife beating: A test of a feminist hypothesis. *Violence and Victims, 5,* 257-273.

Southworth, C., Dawson, S., Fraser, C., & Tucker, S. (2005). A high-tech twist on abuse: Technology, intimate partner stalking, and advocacy. Violence Against Women Online Resources.

Southworth, C., Finn, J., Dawson, S., Fraser, C., & Tucker, S. (2007). Intimate partner violence, technology, and stalking. *Violence Against Women, 13*(8), 842-856.

Spence-Diehl, E. (2003). Stalking and technology: The double-edged sword. *Journal of Technology in Human Services, 22*(1), 5-18.

Spitzberg, B.H., & Hoobler, G. (2002). Cyberstalking and the technologies of interpersonal terrorism. *New Media & Society, 4*(1), 71-92.

Spitzberg, B.H., & Cupach, W.R. (2007). The state of art of stalking: Taking stock of the emerging literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 12,* 64-86.

Stalking Resource Center. The National Center for Victims of Crime (2003). Stalking technology outpaces state laws. *Stalking Resource Center Newsletter, 3*(2).

Stalking Resource Center. The National Center for Victims of Crime. (2009). Social networking sites: A bonanza for stalkers? Retrieved August 28, 2009 from http://www.ncvc.org/src/main.aspx?dbID=DB_SocialNetworkingSites932.

Tessier, M. (2006). Hi-tech stalking devices extend abusers' reach. *Women's e-news*. Retrieved from http://www.ncdsv.org/images/Hi-Tech Stalking Devices Extend Abusers' Reach.pdf.

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1998a). *Prevalence, Incidence, and consequences of violence against women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*. (NCJ No. 172837). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1998b). *Stalking in America: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*. (NCJ No. 169592). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000a). *Full report of the prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*. (NCJ No. 183781). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000b). The role of stalking in domestic violence crime reports generated by the Colorado Springs Police Department. *Violence and Victims, 15*(4), 427-441.

Tjaden, P., Thoennes, N., & Allison, C. J. (2000). Comparing stalking victimization from legal and victim perspectives. *Violence and Victims, 15*(1), 7-22.

Tucker, S., Cremer, T., Fraser, C., & Southworth, C. (2005). A high-tech twist on abuse. *Family Violence Prevention and Health Practices, 3,* 1-5.

United States Department of Justice (1999). *Cyberstalking: A new challenge for law enforcement and industry – A report from the attorney general to the Vice President*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. *National crime victimization survey: Stalking victimization supplement, 2006* [Computer file]. ICPSR 20080-v1. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2009-01-16. doi: 10.3886/ICPSR20080.

United States Department of Justice, Violence Against Women Office. (2001). *Stalking and domestic violence: Report to Congress*. (NCJ No. 186157). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Wajcman, J. (2009). Feminist theories of technology. *Cambridge Journal of Economics, 2009,* 1-10.

Westrup, D., & Fremouw, W.J. (1998). Stalking behavior: A literature review and suggested functional analytic assessment technology. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 3*(3), 255-274.

Westrup, D., Fremouw, W.J., Thompson, R.N., & Lewis, S.F. (1999). The psychological impact of stalking on female undergraduates. *Journal of Forensic Science, 44*(3), 554-557.

Wright, J.A., Burgess, A.G., Burgess, A.W, Laszlo, A.T., McCrary, G.O, & Douglas, D.E. (1996). A typology of interpersonal stalking. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 11*(4), 487-502.

Yllö, K. (1984). The status of women, marital equality, and violence against wives. *Journal of Family Issues, 5,* 307-320.

Yllö, K.A. (2005). Through a feminist lens: Gender, diversity, and violence: Extending the feminist framework. In Loseke, D.R., Gelles, R.J., & Cavanaugh, M.M. (Eds.) *Current controversies on family violence* (pp.19-34). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.