

Research on Stalking:

What Do We Know and Where Do We Go?

Keith E. Davis

University of South Carolina

Irene Hanson Frieze

University of Pittsburgh

In this chapter, we want to look at how our knowledge of stalking victims and perpetrators has been extended by the contributors to this volume. We also want to examine how stalking fits into the context of research and theory about relationship violence. An understanding of several aspects of stalking has been developed in this collection. These include dyadic, perpetrator and victim characteristics (including gender), social/family networks, and developmental histories of relationships as factors in stalking but, with exception of White, Kowalski, Lyndon, and Valentine's, our contributors have had little to say about the cultural context of stalking. We will organize our review by victims, perpetrators, theories, and methods.

Victims of Stalking

The major work on victimization is the National Violence Against Women (NVAW) Survey jointly funded by the National Institute of Justice and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and reported by Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) and Tjaden, Thoennes, and Allison (this volume). Data from the NVAW Survey suggest that using either a behavioral definition or a self-classification scheme, women reported more stalking victimization than did men (8.1% vs. 2.2% with a behavioral definition and 12.1% vs. 6.2% with a self-classification scheme). Differences in results using the behavioral definition and the self-classification scheme were due primarily to the fact that about 60% of the persons who self-classified as stalked did not meet the fear criterion of the behavioral definition—either they did not feel very frightened or they did not think that they or someone close to them would be seriously harmed. Male respondents' increased reluctance to express fear may also explain the gender differences reported by Tjaden and colleagues (this volume)—a difference not consistently seen in the other articles in the volume. Both women and men who had been intimate with the perpetrator were more likely to self-classify as stalked than those who had not.

Results from the national survey data (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998) indicate that women—but not men—tend to be stalked in the context of current or former intimate relationships (marriage, cohabitation, or dating). Stalking, particularly of women by ex-husbands, was strongly related to physical abuse in the relationship. The levels of distress reported by women and men were quite substantial, and the psychological impact was great. Both male and female victims of stalking were more likely to report they were very concerned about their safety than non-victims (42% vs. 24%). They also tended to carry something to protect themselves (45% vs. 29%). Over a quarter of all victims sought counseling during the process. And many were provoked to take extreme actions such as getting a gun (17%), changing addresses (11%) or moving out of town (11%), to deter the stalker (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). There are thus several major themes to explore: How are prevalence rates for stalking connected to the specific behavioral definitions used? How is stalking related to gender? To physical and psychological abuse in the relationships? To its emotional and life-changing consequences?

Prevalence and Specific Definitions. In Table 1, we have arranged all five of the indices of stalking that play a major role in this volume. The starting point for almost all of them is the NVAW Survey, which used eight types of behaviors with two additional criteria. A behavior had to be engaged in more than one time (consistent with the legal requirement of a pattern of behavior), and “only respondents who were very frightened or feared bodily harm [to themselves or someone close] were counted as stalking victims” (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998, p. 17). At the other end of the spectrum are Cupach and Spitzberg’s (1998) Obsessional Relational Intrusion (ORI) measure, which contained 63 items. While one can see that many of the ORI items could be seen as specific instances of the eight NVAW items, the ORI intentionally sampled far beyond the NVAW Survey by inquiring about highly threatening, coercive, vandalizing, and intrusive behaviors. The ORI can be factored into four clusters of items that they have labeled *pursuit*, *violation*, *violence*, and *hyper-intimacy*. Except for item 8 (the vandalism item) in the NVAW survey, it deals largely with behaviors that fall into Cupach and Spitzberg’s *pursuit* factor or into the milder forms of stalking harassment identified by others (Coleman, 1997; Davis, Ace, & Andra, this volume; Sinclair & Frieze, this volume). In between these two measures are Sinclair and Frieze’s Courtship Persistence Inventory, which has 43 items, loading on six conceptually distinct clusters. Palarea and Langhinrichsen-Rohling’s (1998) Pursuit Behavior Inventory which has 26 items that yield 3 separate scores (mild, severe, and total stalking); Coleman’s 26-item measure that distinguishes stalking harassment from stalking violence; and Davis, Ace, and Andra’s (2000) inventory which has 20 items to identify four clusters of stalking-like

behaviors. Logan, Leukefeld, and Walker (this volume) used a slightly modified version of Coleman's measure.

The ORI generated much higher rates of stalking victimization which were found in three separate samples of college students than did the NVAW survey (Cupach & Spitzberg, this volume). In their initial instructions, Cupach and Spitzberg did not require persistent or repeated instances of the ORI behaviors and their data have been reported in terms of percent "ever" not multiple events as in the NVAW. Their broader definition turns up more cases, but their recent directions emphasize that the behaviors must be persistent. Logan and colleagues (this volume) and Davis, Ace, and Andra (1999) both required multiple events of stalking-like behavior for the person to be classified as having been stalked. For the Stalking Harassment items, Logan and associates reported a stalking victimization rate that ranged from 62% (for "called at home") to 9% (for "drove by home" and "sent photos") with a median of 22%. For the stalking violence or more severe items, the range was from 20% ("damaged property of new partner") to 0% (several items) with a median of 6.2%.

Davis, Ace, and Andra (1999), in two separate samples of college students, used the exact wording of the NVAW survey, with slightly different response alternatives (“Never, a few times, or several times”). The findings were quite consistent in the two samples. Using the criterion of “a few times,” 53.7% reported receiving unsolicited phone calls, and 9.4% reported being vandalized. With the criterion of “several times,” these prevalence rates dropped to 11.5% for unsolicited phone calls and 1.4% for vandalism. Averaging across all eight items, 5.8% of the two samples reported stalking victimization at the level of “several times.” Two factors—other than specific item wording and the frequency of occurrence—are probably relevant to the levels of stalking victimization found among the different samples. Researchers are beginning to establish that victims feel afraid rather than merely that some potentially harassing behaviors has occurred (Bjerregaard, this volume; Cupach & Spitzberg, this volume). With the criterion of being “very afraid” only 9.5% (study 1) and 10.8% (study 2) could be classified as having been stalked (Davis et al., 1999). These figures are much closer to the NVAW findings. The other factor that is probably at work is cohort/age. Seventy-four per cent of women victims reported that they were first stalked at the age of 39 or earlier (52% at 29 or younger). The cohorts becoming teenagers in the 1980’s and 1990’s have had the chance to learn about the crime of celebrity stalking, and to know that it could happen to them (Schaum & Parrish, 1995). Rather than giving such behaviors a benign interpretation, they are probably more likely to classify it as stalking and to consider reporting it to the authorities (Tjaden, Thoennes, & Allison, this volume).

Even this very brief survey suggests that the specific definitions of stalking used by researchers affects the reported frequency. Definitions can be primarily legal (e.g., Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998) or more related to clinical cases that include physical and sexual threats (e.g., Coleman, 1997; Cupach & Spitzberg, this volume; and Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., this volume). Sinclair and Frieze (this volume) and White and associates (pp. 373-388) have made the case that behavioral research cannot be limited entirely to the legal definition, but must look at courtship persistent behaviors and milder forms of stalking to fully understand the phenomenon. Conceptually, there is a good reason to continue research on measures of stalking victimization that maintain a finer range of distinctions than those embodied in the original NVAW items. To the degree that one issue is how full-blown dangerous stalking develops out of the milder harassment cases, we need measures of the distinct stages or types of stalking-like behaviors (Emerson, et al., 1997). Maintaining finer distinctions—such as those in Cupach and Spitzberg’s ORI, Langhinrichsen-Rohling and colleagues (pp. 459-472) Pursuit Behavior Inventory, or Sinclair and Frieze’s Courtship Behavior Scale (this volume)—should allow one to detect differences in which behaviors are seen as normative versus those that cross the line to intrusion and harassment. Furthermore, the correlates and risk factors for stalking threat and vandalism may be quite different from those for courtship persistence and milder stalking harassment.

Gender and Stalking Victimization. Stalking that reaches police attention and stalking as defined by the NVAW survey is strongly the case of female victims (78%) and male perpetrators (86%). Campus surveys with large convenience samples also show that pattern (Fremouw, Westrup, & Pennypacker, 1996). But Cupach and Spitzberg (1998, this volume; Spitzberg, Nicastro, & Cousins, 1998) consistently do not find gender differences in being victimized on the individual ORI items.¹ And Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Palarea, Cohen, and Rohling (this volume) also failed to find a gender difference. How does one reconcile these findings? One possibility is that the *same behaviors are appraised differently as a function of gender*, such that when a man follows, engages in vandalism, or in threats, the behaviors are taken more seriously by a woman than when a woman engages in similar behaviors toward a man. Magdol and associates (1997) have offered a similar interpretation of the differences in reported partner violence in their birth cohort sample of New Zealand youth. In that sample, women report a significantly higher level of physical violence than men, but the women who were abused were more anxious about violence and more likely to get hurt. Magdol and coworkers (1997) suggest that the correlates and thus the meaning of violence are quite different for women and men in these relationships. Except for the most extreme case, women were unlikely to really hurt their partners; they can thus express their anger and irritation physically without fear of damaging consequences. In contrast, when the men lose control, they violate their status as protectors of their partner and are much more likely genuinely to hurt their partner. For men, physical aggression within relationships is correlated with a much different pattern of variables than for women—a

pattern that points toward psychopathology, substance abuse, and status/power inequalities as characteristics of violent men, according to Magdol and colleagues (1997).

Bjerregaard's (pp. 389-406) study of a representative sample of a large southeastern university found that, although there were no gender differences in the frequency of stalking victimization, women had significantly higher levels-almost 3 times as high-of "fear of physical safety" and "fear for emotional safety" than did men.

In two studies, Davis, Ace, and Andra (1999) examined the same issue with respect to stalking victimization. Using the eight items from the NVAW survey, no consistent differences were found between men and women students in the overall experience of stalking-harassment behaviors, but women (stalked by men) were significantly more afraid in both samples. To the degree that males see threats as more acceptable in the context of romantic rejection (as the data on perpetrators gathered by Sinclair and Frieze [this volume] show), they may give off cues of threat without making explicit threats. In effect, the same behaviors may be more dangerous and hence more fear-provoking when exhibited by a man.

Cupach and Spitzberg (pp. 357-372) also have critically examined the meaning of gender differences and their lack among ORI clusters. They found that “men were likely to experience milder forms of ORI (*privacy invasion* and *hyper-intimacy*) than women, while women may be more likely to be victims of severe and violent intrusions. The size of differences was quite small [but] women perceived *all* types of intrusion to be more distressing [as indicated by the four ratings of annoyance, upset, threatened, and privacy violated] than did men” (Cupach & Spitzberg, pp. 357-372). A direct test of the different implication of being stalked as a woman or as a man needs to be made, but these studies suggest that an interpretation similar to that of Magdol and associates (1997) would integrate seemingly disparate findings.

Threatened and Actual Abuse by Stalkers.

The early consensus was that most stalkers, while disturbing to victims, are not physically violent (Zona, et al., 1993; where they reported a 2.3% violence rate). But recent studies, which take advantage of distinctions among types of stalkers and which have used multivariate statistical techniques all agree that former intimate partner stalkers—particularly sexually intimates—are much more dangerous to their ex-partners than non-intimate stalkers (Melay, in press; Mullen, Pathe, & Purcell, 2000; Palarea, Zona, Lane, & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1999). Indeed, Meloy (in press) now summarizes the implications of these studies as follows: “Risk management of prior sexually intimate stalking cases should assume that an act of interpersonal violence toward the object of pursuit will occur at some point in the stalking crime” (p. 23).

In addition to the NVAW which found 81% of women who were stalked by an ex-husband were physically assaulted by that person and 31% were sexually assaulted (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998), four chapters to this volume bring additional information to bear of the connection among stalking, psychological violence, and physical abuse.

In the Mechanic, Weaver and Resick study (this volume) the level of stalking acknowledged was 20 to 30 times higher than Coleman (1997) found in his study of college students. In contrast with the NVAW sample, where explicit verbal threats were made to only 45% of the women stalked, 94% of the Mechanic et al. (this volume) sample of abused women received threats. In their sample, psychological abuse prior to separation was the strongest predictor of violent stalking and of the victim's subsequent fear, controlling for physical violence. Brewster (this volume), in a study of volunteers for a study of stalking, found that 46% were physically attacked after leaving an intimate relationship, and that 86% of these suffered physical injury as a result. The best predictor of physical violence as part of stalking was a threat of violence and physical harm by the perpetrators. The use of alcohol or drugs by the perpetrators also predicted injury. Both Davis and his associates (this volume) and Logan and associates (this volume) have shown that psychological abuse in a relationship that ultimately ends in a difficult breakup is a very strong predictor of subsequent stalking victimization for both men and women. However, for the male perpetrators, alcohol use was much more predictive of both stalking and psychological abuse than for female stalking perpetrators.

Impact of Stalking Victimization. Individual case studies of stalking victims (Orion, 1997; Pathé & Mullen, 1997) document the pervasiveness of fear, anger, and distress at not being able to control one's privacy. The NVAW survey (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998) documents the range of behaviors that victims take to deal with their experience of victimization and the impact of the experience. The levels of distress reported by women and men were quite substantial. Thirty per cent of the women and 20% of the men victims sought counseling. The psychological impact was equally great, for it seemed to affect feelings of personal safety (68% saw it as having gotten worse), their level of concern about personal safety (42% very concerned), and their tendency to carry something to protect themselves (45%). Hall (1996, 1998) in a study of male and female stalking victims found that both (83%) reported that their personalities had changed as a result of the experience. They had become more cautious (85%), more paranoid (40%), felt more easily frightened (53%), and had become much more aggressive (30%). Spitzberg, Nicastro, and Cousin (1998) developed a 30-item measure of relevant symptoms, and created 3 scales (angst, fear, and hopelessness) after-factor to analyze the items. Angst items reflected "general stress" and "depression;" fear items included "paranoia" and "feelings of being watched;" hopelessness items included a "loss of faith" in aspects of the justice system and related world. Students who self-categorized themselves as having been stalked had significantly higher symptom reports on all three scales. The number and duration of stalking incidents were also predictive of levels of angst and fear.

Mechanic, Uhlmansiek, Weaver, and Resick (pp. 443-458) used the Posttraumatic Diagnostic Scale (PDS), developed by Foa, Cashman, Jaycox, and Perry (1997) to assess the impact of violent stalking on their sample of battered women. Relentlessly stalked battered women reported more severe PTSD symptoms than did those who were infrequently stalked. Since all of the women in the sample had been battered, a partial control for that variable has been introduced. Still it must be acknowledged that the co-occurrence of physical violence and stalking makes it hard to disentangle these variables in this study.

All of the studies that have examined the issue support the conclusion that stalking, that is accompanied by assaults and verbal threats, is strongly connected to serious emotional consequences for victims. The consequences are revealed in their emotional liability as indicated by the PDS arousal scale, in their background levels of fear, and in the view that their world has become a more dangerous place in which to live—one that requires much more caution and protective action on their parts. The patterns are reminiscent of those described by Janoff-Bulman (1992) in her discussion of *Shattered Assumptions*. In more than 20 years of work with trauma victims, she found that trauma such as rape, threat of death, and untimely loss of a partner, tends to shatter a person's assumptions that they are safe and not vulnerable to harm. Most persons take it for granted that they are worthy, that the world is benevolent, and that whatever happens to them makes sense. Becoming a trauma victim can undermine all of these assumptions. Stalking, unlike some traumas, continues over significant periods of time—the average case occurred over 1.8 years (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). One has to continue dealing with it, often with the strong sense that nothing can prevent the stalker from continuing his or her intrusion into one's life (Orion, 1997). Thus, one might expect reactions to be more severe than might be expected by looking at the severity of the acts committed. Stalking victims may be analogous to hostages or even to incest victims. See Mechanic's chapter in this volume for a much more detailed review of issues related to impact, coping, and the clinical management of stalking.

Coping. The pervasiveness of stalking experiences and their potential to become quite troubling and problematic for the victims takes us to the next issue: What is known about the ways in which people try to cope with stalking and what is their relative effectiveness? The identification of patterns of coping has been one of Cupach and Spitzberg's (pp. 357-372, 1996; Spitzberg, Nicastro, and Cousin's [1998]) major contributions. Starting with 50's self-report items, they developed a five-factor structure. The factors are *interactional coping* (e.g., had a serious talk, told the person that what he was doing was wrong, or cursed at them and used obscenities), *retaliation* (threats), *protection* (e.g., call the police, seek a restraining order), *evasion* (e.g., moving, changing jobs or schools), or *technology* (e.g., obtaining caller ID or the call-back feature for the telephone).

The number, duration, and intensity of stalking experiences was related to the number and frequency of coping attempts. The more one attempted to cope in one way, the more one also used other methods of coping. All forms of coping were moderately to strongly interrelated (r s from .20 to .70) with each other. The more symptoms of distress at being stalked, the more forms of coping that one used. One interpretation of these findings is: "the more a person is obsessively pursued, the more this person attempts to cope, and the increased coping is merely a barometer of the stalking and its disruptiveness, rather than a method of effectively diminishing the negative effects of the stalking" (Spitzberg, Nicastro, & Cousins, 1998, p. 43). As they note, other interpretations are also plausible, and the most interesting questions may well concern how and when coping is attempted rather than the frequency of attempts. Certainly, we have very little systematic work on the effectiveness of various methods of dealing with stalkers.

Perpetrators of Stalking

While the clinical and forensic literature on aspects of stalking perpetration is quite large, systematic empirical research is only beginning. Three of the articles in this issue make major contributions by first conceptualizing stalking as a continuum from normal but persistent courtship behaviors to various forms of harassment ending in violent stalking (Davis et al., Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Palarea, Cohen, & Rohling; and Sinclair & Frieze). The clinical and forensic literature has been carefully summarized by Meloy (1998) and by White and associates (this volume), but it is worth touching on the highlights as they provide a context for the research reported below. In the case of women and men victims, their stalkers were more likely to be male. The majority of stalkers are not mentally disturbed, but rather obsessively focused on a specific person with whom they have had some previous relationship. The NVAW survey suggests that at least 59% of the stalkers who stalked women had been husbands, ex-husbands or boyfriends. In the study based on the files of the Los Angeles Police Department, Zona, Palarea, and Lane (1998) have found that 65% of their sample had a prior, often intimate relationship with the stalker. Thus stalking is often related to a failed or blocked relationship in which a stalker feels rejected by a desired love object. A subset of stalkers has, however, a history of limited and unsuccessful relationships, and they tend to live alone and to be underemployed. According to Zona and colleagues (1998), stalkers are more likely to have used physical or verbal abuse in the relationship (before it broke up) than are nonstalkers. Likewise, the clinical data indicate that a subset of stalkers has a history of alcohol or drug abuse (Hall, 1998) and, for men, this finding has been supported by Logan and associates' data (this volume). The NVAW study indicates that victims' perception of why they were stalked included

control (21%), to keep the victims in the relationship (20%), and to scare the victims (16%). The exercise of control is perceived by victims as central to the stalker's purposes as indicated by the original Tjaden and Thoennes report (1998) and by Langhinrichsen-Rohling and associates (this volume).

Self-Reported Incidents of Stalking. In the Fremouw and colleagues (1997) study of college students, only 3 males (2.3%) reported engaging in stalking defined as “knowing and repeatedly following, harassing, or threatening someone.” No females acknowledged engaging in stalking. Both theoretical work and empirical work by Baumeister, Wotman, and Stillman (1993) suggest that stalking is more likely to develop in the context of an unrequited love or the experience of being rejected by a previous lover.

Sinclair and Frieze (this volume) chose to focus on the assessment of courtship and stalking-like behaviors in the context of unrequited loves. Participants were recruited for a study of “Loving when your partner does not love back,” and the instructions for the survey asked them to “report on crushes, love interests or passionate love they felt for another that was not reciprocated” (Sinclair & Frieze, this volume). In this context, 18% of the students acknowledged “[being] aggressive to get his/her attention” and 18% acknowledged going “too far in trying to get his/her attention.” Using the factor—derived scales rather than single items, 29% reported intimidation, 24% verbal or mild physical aggression, and 13% threat or attempted physical harm. In no case did they find gender differences in self-report of these stalking-like activities, but their sample of men was small ($N = 44$).

Within a large convenience sample of undergraduates, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Palarea, Cohen, and Rohling (this volume) distinguished between initiators of relationship breakups and receivers of the breakup. Men were slightly more likely than women to claim to have initiated the breakup. As expected, almost all receivers acknowledged engaging in at least one pursuit behavior, and 27.5% admitted having done at least one thing that had a negative impact on the former partner. However, only 3.3% reported engaging in a severe pursuit behavior such as threats or damage to property. Breakup initiators, however, reported receiving a much higher level of severe stalking (14%). They did not find gender differences in self-reported Pursuit Behaviors.

In the Davis and colleague's studies (pp. 407-426), a criterion of six stalking behaviors was used as an index of significant stalking. Ten and seven-tenths percent of those in Study 1 and 7.6% in Study 2 acknowledged engaging in 6 or more stalking activities after breakups. Stalking was more likely after being rejected in a relationship, after multiple breakups, and was markedly greater among those breakups where the person felt a combination of anger, jealousy, and obsessiveness. These estimates fall in the same range as those from Langhinrichsen-Rohling and colleagues (this volume) and Logan and coworkers (this volume), but are lower than the estimates reported by Sinclair and Frieze (this volume) who used a criterion of "ever" versus "never" in the scoring of the courtship persistence.

Not only do rejected or unrequited lovers not see themselves as engaging the level and severity of stalking that those who initiate the breakups report, but they seem blind to the impact of even their milder stalking behaviors. Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Palarea, Cohen, and Rohling asked for comments about the partner's reaction to any incidents reported, and also got ratings of the degree to which the partner may have changed in love, anger, fear, sadness, or guilt. Receivers who initiated various Pursuit Behaviors gave them much lower ratings on negative impact on the ex-partner than did persons rating the impact of getting such attention. It is important to remember that the receivers and initiators are not reporting on the same breakups, and thus perfect correspondence would not be expected, but discrepancies of this magnitude are suggestive of motivated distortion by stalkers or the conscious giving of socially desirable responses.

Sinclair and Frieze (this volume) found a similar pattern. Perpetrators placed a largely positive interpretation on their behaviors. They report low levels (2% to 16%) of real threatening and damaging behaviors. Only 18% viewed themselves as having gone too far in their pursuit of the wished-for partner.

To what extent are these findings relevant to stalking perpetrators as legally defined? That is not entirely clear because each research team has used its own definition, and also because the base-rate of self-acknowledged severe or violent stalking is quite low. But substantial proportions of the participants in both studies acknowledge engaging in surveillance, in unwanted persistence in contact, and in verbal abuse and threats. This provides a situation in which one can meaningfully examine the correlates of stalking-like behavior, and it is to that which we now turn.

**PREDICTORS OF STALKING-LIKE BEHAVIOR AFTER
BREAKUPS OR UNREQUITED LOVES**

Kurt (1995) reminds us that stalking is part of the constellation of behaviors associated with domestic violence. White and colleagues (pp. 373-388) also have used that insight as one foundation for their overview of current literature on interpersonal aggression and stalking. Logan, Leukefeld, and Walker (this volume) have conducted one of the first studies to examine whether stalking after a “difficult break up with an intimate partner” was related to the degree of psychological and physical violence in that relationship. When they examined the correlates of stalking perpetration, they found that, for men, stalking perpetration was associated with heavy drinking, the use of alcohol or drugs during sex, or the perception of self as having been a victim of stalking and psychological abuse. For women, none of the correlates of stalking perpetration was as strong as for men, and only stalking victimization, psychological abuse victimization, and the use of drugs or alcohol during sex were significantly related to stalking perpetration. The pattern suggested that male stalkers tended to justify their own stalking (and aggression) by blaming their partners much more than did women. The data from Mechanic and associates (this volume) sample of acutely abused women also fits. Psychological abuse (specifically the dominance/isolation subscale of Tolman’s [1989] PMWI scale) during the relationship was the strongest predictor of subsequent stalking behavior. A tentative interpretation is that men are much more likely to see stalking as a way of continuing to control the ex-partner than are women. This interpretation is supported by the consistently strong relationship between need for control as measured by the Follingstad, Rutledge, McNeill-Harkins, and Polek (1988) measure in the two samples collected by Davis and coworkers (pp. 406-422). Differences in strength and willingness to engage in the use of force may be part of the

story, but, in a culture with some vestiges of patriarchal ideology, they may feel more entitled to attempt to control a woman who was once “theirs.”

From the victim’s perspective, the NVAW data are particularly revealing. Exhibit 13 in their Research Brief (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998) showed that victims thought that their stalkers wanted to control them (21%), to keep them in the relationship (20%), or to scare them (16%). Among ex-husbands who stalked, there was a strong connection with control, emotional abuse, and jealousy (see Exhibit 14 in Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). When Langhinrichsen-Rohling and associates (this volume) asked their respondents who had initiated breakups about the kinds of things the stalkers did and their characteristics, a similar cluster appeared. Degree of pursuit behavior was related to the perception of the partner as jealous, controlling, and emotionally abusive prior to the breakup.

Spitzberg and Cupach (1999, May) have reported strong connections among jealousy-based restrictiveness and aggressive jealousy and behaviors of both an aggressive sort and pursuit or harassing sort. Guerrero (1998) has shown that attachment insecurity is connected to several aspects of jealousy and that together they predict engaging in surveillance and stalking-like behaviors. In the Davis and coworkers studies (pp. 406-422), the constellation of anger-jealousy-obsessiveness was consistently predictive of stalking, and the degree to which individuals had these feelings at the time of a breakup was correlated with anxious attachment.

Summary of Perpetrator Results

What do these studies suggest about the psychology of stalkers? The early insight that stalking had to do with pathologies of love (Mullen & Pathe, 1994) has been borne out. Some stalkers want more than anything else to reestablish or initiate intimate relationships. In this context, the predictors and correlates of the milder form of stalking are those that related to intensity and characteristics of romantic love relationships. Thus, erotic and manic love styles, and the degree of anxious attachment were predictors of courtship persistence and the milder forms of stalking. But some stalking is driven more by control and revenge than by merely reestablishing a love relationship. In Sinclair and Frieze (this volume), feelings of vengefulness, wanting to hurt, and feelings of being deceived were the strongest emotional correlates of stalking for both men and women. And in both the Logan and colleagues (this volume) and Mechanic and associates (this volume) studies, psychological abuse during the relationship was the strongest predictor of subsequent stalking of a serious and potentially dangerous sort.

TYOLOGIES AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS FOR UNDERSTANDING INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE AND STALKING

Typologies

By distinguishing among types of batterers (and stalkers), one is likely to have a more adequate and practically useful set of categories. Furthermore, evidence is beginning to develop that stalking during and after an intimate relationship is related to psychological and physical violence within the relationship prior to breakup (Davis et al., pp. 406-426; Emerson et al., 1998; Logan et al., this volume; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). With respect to batterers, Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) reviewed the existing studies and proposed that three general types could be distinguished in terms of severity of violence, generality of violence, and nature of the psychopathology exhibited. *Family-only* batterers committed the least and less severe violence toward their partners of the other two groups; they were more likely to fall in the passive-dependent personality disorder. Their violence tended to be only within the family—not general, and they had less involvement with drugs and with other crimes. *Borderline/dysphoric* batterers engaged in moderate to severe marital violence and were more likely to have used both psychological abuse and sexual abuse than family-only batterers. They were much more likely to qualify with a psychopathology—most often of the borderline personality, dysphoria, or the emotional volatility type. This group was more likely to use either alcohol or drugs to cope with distress than the family-only batterers were.

Antisocial batterers used moderate to severe physical violence in relationship as well as psychological and sexual abuse. But they also have a history of violence outside the family, trouble with the law, and a pattern of alcohol and drug use. As the label indicates, this group is most likely to be classified as antisocial personality disorder or psychopaths. Several studies have supported the soundness of these distinctions (Hamberger, Lohr, Bonge, & Tolin, 1996; Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, & Stuart, 1999). These typologies are also beginning to inform treatment programs for batterers (Saunders, 1996).

Gottman and Jacobson (1998) offer support for the importance of several of these dimensions. In a sample of 201 couples, they identified 63 in which the wives were repeatedly beaten and emotionally abused—thus eliminating low-level common couple violence from their analysis. Within the 63 couples, they identified two types of batterers—*pit bulls* and *cobras*. These two show marked similarity to the *borderline/dysphoric* and *antisocial* batterers of Holtzworth-Munroe. Pit bulls were described as jealous, fearful of abandonment, and determined to reduce the independence of their partners. They were prone to rage at threats to the relationship, and likely to engage in stalking to re-assert control. They were unlikely to have criminal records and tended to confine their violence to people whom they love. *Cobras*, in contrast, were not emotionally dependent upon the partner, but rather determined to have their way. They were capable of violence to pets and nonfamily members. They were more likely to threaten or use weapons and to have a history of crime. One striking contrast between the two groups was the tendency of *cobras* to become physiologically calm before and during violence, whereas the *pit bulls* became physiologically aroused.

Just as students of interpersonal violence have found it important to distinguish subtypes, the same applies to the case for stalking. Zona, Palarea, and Lane (1998) have continued to refine a three-category distinction—simple obsessional, love obsessional, and erotomaniac—which is based on clinical judgments of files from the Los Angeles Police Department's Threat Management Unit. Simple obsessional stalkers may also be divided into two subgroups—those who had had a previous intimate relationship with the victim (the largest category in their studies) and those who knew the victim from a work or professional setting, but who had not dated or been intimate. Within each of these groups, two motives seemed paramount in stalking. The first was a desire to coerce the victim into (or back into) a relationship and the second was revenge for some real or imagined act of mistreatment. Obsessional and erotomaniac stalkers are both out of touch with reality in that the former develops an obsession with a public figure who has power, status, beauty, or is a celebrity, and the latter has an obsession with someone in his personal network. Many of these stalkers meet criteria for serious psychopathology, such as schizophrenia or bipolar disorder. They have seldom had meaningful intimate relationships and tend to be prone to alcohol and substance abuse. Erotomanics are more likely to be female, and to have a firm delusion of having a real relationship with a high status male whom they know but with whom there is no such relationship.

Recently Mullen, Pathé, and Purcell (2000) have made a major contribution to the classification of types of stalkers. Three dimensions are considered in the typology: the motivational functions of stalking, the previous relationship with the victim, and the type and degree of psychopathology. The motivational typology is novel and supported by a careful study of 168 cases. They separate stalkers into the rejected, the intimacy seekers,

the resentful, the predatory, and the incompetent. The rejected have been prevented from establishing or continuing a relationship that they desired, and they want either to reconcile or force the victim to suffer. Intimacy seekers are lonely persons who want to relationship. The resentful stalkers see themselves as having been insulted and want revenge and vindication. The predatory are attempting to gain control and sexual gratification. The incompetents are would be suitors whose approaches are counter-productive. “The typology alone, and when taken together with the prior relationship and psychiatric diagnosis, enabled predictions to be made about the duration of stalking, the nature of the stalking behaviors, the risks of threatening and violent behavior, and to some extent the response to management strategies” (2000, p.76).

Because stalking is an instrumental behavior which can have several different goals—not just reestablishment of a relationship or revenge when one is rejected, it is clearly important to gain greater insight into what stalkers are trying to accomplish. Further studies such as those of Mullen et al. (2000) are highly desirable because of the implications both for theory and for clinical practice. A promising research technique for identifying motives and cognitions about the targets of stalking are laboratory simulations of conflict and rejection between couples. Eckhardt, Barbour, and Davison (1998) have used audiotaped stimuli designed to elicit jealousy and anger and asked the male participants to imagine themselves in the situations, and to talk out loud about their thoughts and feelings as they listened to the tapes. Their recorded thoughts were analyzed for irrational beliefs, for hostile attributions, cognitive biases, and anger control statements. The coding of the spontaneous thoughts was much more sensitive as a tool for separating marital violent from nonviolent men than were any of the self-report measures. This procedure could be adapted with slight modifications to assess the cognitions and motives relevant to stalking. The use of projective measures and the analysis of spontaneous verbal behavior may allow one to circumvent the inhibitions about the acknowledgment of stalking and related emotions that now yield quite low rates of self-reported stalking.

OVERALL SUMMARY

Although the systematic study of stalking—both of victims and perpetrators—is in its infancy, we can already see some consistent themes in the research evidence. The early clinical and forensic work that emphasized the conceptualization of stalking as pathology of love has borne fruit. One line of investigation that has appeared to be quite productive is the examination of stalking as a form of domestic violence, occurring most often in the context of failed or desired-but-unreciprocated intimate relationships. Many of the same variables that have been implicated in physical and psychological abuse also are implicated in the early studies of stalking: A history of childhood abuse, attachment insecurity that involves anxiety over abandonment or mania and jealousy, and need for control.

Both the clinical-forensic research on stalking and the research on types of aggressors indicate the need for differentiation. Not all stalkers are alike in their motives, their degree of reality contact and specific psychopathologies, or their willingness to engage in physical violence. Related to this effort would be an effort to standardize the assessment of stalking by examining the validity of self-report instruments such as those used in the research in this issue against police and victim reports.

The relationship between gender and stalking remains unclear. The national survey shows many more women victims and a greater emotional impact on women victims. Many other studies of moderately large convenience samples on college campuses have found no or only small gender differences in rates of victimization reported or in self-reported perpetration of stalking. One possibility is that both the different criteria of stalking victimization used and the possibility that the same activities when engaged in by a man rather than by a woman are appraised as more dangerous, may account for the findings.

There are some clear indications of needed research. Victim reports of stalking need to include both the NVAW Survey items and a broader set that allows the distinctions between courtship persistence, stalking harassment, threats, and stalking violence to be detected. Victim reports of the impact of stalking on their worldviews, their perception of personal safety and mental health, such as symptoms of posttraumatic stress and depression, need to be brought together so that a more systematic and refined statement of the impact of stalking victimization can be made. The outline of such an assessment is contained in the NVAW Survey, Cupach and Spitzberg's research, and in Mechanic's contributions to this volume.

We also want to endorse the suggestion made by Emerson and coworkers (1998), Cupach and Spitzberg (this volume) and White and associates (this volume) that we need to move beyond static analyses of stalking and delve into the developmental-interactional history of stalking. We do not know how many cases of courtship persistence or mild stalking turn into more serious harassment or violence vs. those that stop. Nor do we know if there are critical events that can pinpoint such changes. To what degree is the outcome of a rejection dependent upon how it is delivered and whether or not it triggers a sense of humiliation? Reconstructing the history of failed rejections that have led to stalking and of those that successfully ended the relationship would be important. We believe that the articles in this issue provide important data about both the perpetrators and victims of stalking, develop significant conceptual resources for the integration of findings, and identify substantive questions and methodological issues that need to be addressed.

REFERENCES

- Baumeister, R. F., Wotman, S. R., & Stillwell, A. M. (1993). Unrequited love: On heartbreak, anger, guilt, scriptlessness, and humiliation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*, 377-394.
- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*, 217-230.
- Coleman, J. R. (1997). Stalking behavior and the cycle of domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12*, 420-432.

- Cupach, W. R. & Spitzberg, B. H. (1998). Obsessional relational intrusion and stalking. In B. H. Spitzberg & W. R. Cupach (Eds.), *The dark side of close relationships* (pp. 233-263). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Davis, K. E., Ace, A., & Andra, M. (1999).[Stalking victimization data]. Unpublished raw data.
- Eckhardt, C. I., Barbour, K. A., & Davison, G. C. (1998). Articulated thoughts of maritally violent and nonviolent men during anger arousal. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 66*, 259-269.
- Emerson, R. M., Ferris, K. O., & Gardner, C. B.(1998). On being stalked. *Social Problems, 45*, 289-314.
- Foa, E. B., Cashman, L., Jaycox, L., & Perry, K. (1997). The validation of a self-report measure of posttraumatic stress disorder: The posttraumatic diagnostic scale. *Psychological Assessment, 9*, 445-451.
- Fremouw, W. J., Westrup, D., & Pennypacker, J. (1997). Stalking on campus: The prevalence and strategies for coping with stalking. *Journal of Forensic Sciences, 42*, 664-667.
- Gottman, J. & Jacoson, N. (1998). *When men batter women*. NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Guerreo, L. K. (1998). Attachment-style differences in the experience and expression of romantic jealousy. *Personal Relationships, 5*, 273-291.
- Hall, D. M. (1998). The victims of stalking. In J. R. Meloy (Ed.), *The psychology of stalking* (pp. 113-137). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

- Hamberger, L. K., Lohr, J. M., Bonge, D., & Tolin, D. F. (1996). A large sample empirical typology of male spouse abusers and its relationship to dimensions of abuse. *Violence & Victims, 11*, 277-292.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Meehan, J. C., Herron, K., & Stuart, G. L. (1999) A typology of male batterers. In X. B. Arriaga & S. Oskamp (Eds.), *Violence in intimate relationships* (pp. 45-71). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Stuart, G. L. (1994). Typologies of male batterers: Three subtypes and differences among them. *Psychological Bulletin, 116*, 476-497.
- Janoff-Bulman, R. (1992). *Shattered assumptions: Toward a new psychology of trauma*. NY: The Free Press.
- Johnson, M. P. (1995). Patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence: Two forms of violence against women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57*, 283-294.
- Kurt, J. L. (1995). Stalking as a variant of domestic violence. *Bulletin of the Academy of Psychiatry and the Law, 23*, 219-223.
- Magdol, L., Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Newman, D. N., Fagan, J., & Silva, P. A. (1997). Gender differences in partner violence in a birth cohort of 21-year-olds: Bridging the gap between clinical and epidemiological approaches. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 65*, 68-78.
- Meloy, J. R. (in press). Stalking and violence. In J. Boon & L. Sheridan (Eds.), Stalking and psychosexual obsession. London: Wiley.
- Meloy, J. R. (1998). The psychology of stalking. In J. R. Meloy (Ed.), *The psychology of stalking* (pp. 1-27). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

- Mullen, P. E., Pathe, M., & Purcell, R. (2000). Stalkers and their victims. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Orion, D. (1997). *I know you really love me*. NY: MacMillan.
- Pathe, M., & Mullen, P. E. (1997). The impact of stalkers on their victims. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, *170*, 12-17.
- Saunders, D. G. (1996). Feminist-cognitive-behavioral and process-psychodynamic treatments for men who batter: Interaction of abuser traits and treatment models. *Violence and Victims*, *11*, 393-414.
- Schaum, M. & Parrish, K. (1995). *Stalked: Breaking the silence on the crime of stalking in America*. NY: Pocket Books.
- Spitzberg, B. H., Nicastro, A. M., & Cousins, A. V. (1998). Exploring the interactional phenomenon of stalking and obsessive relational intrusion. *Communications Reports*, *11*, 33-47.
- Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (1999, May). *Jealousy, suspicion, possessiveness and obsession as predictors of obsessive relational intrusion*. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, San Francisco, CA.
- Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. J. (1990). *Physical violence in American families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1998). *Stalking in America: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey* (NCJ Report no. 169592). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Tolman, R. M. (1989). The development of a measure of psychological maltreatment of women by their male partners. *Violence and Victims, 4*, 159-177.

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

Zona, Sharma, K. K., Lane, J. (1993). A comparative study of erotomanic and obsessional subjects in a forensic sample. *Journal of Forensic Sciences, 38*, 894-903.

TABLE 1. Comparing Measures of Stalking Behavior

	C&S	T&T	L-R	S&F	LLW	DAA
Spying on you	*	*		*	*	
Follow you	*	*	*	*	*	
Sending notes	*	*	*	*	*	*
Unwanted phone calls	*	*	*		*	*
Left messages on telephone	*		*			
Recorded conversations w/you secretly	*					
Send gifts			*	*C	*	*
Sent (offensive) photos	*				*	
Waited (in car) for you	*		*	*		
Left notes on your windshield	*					
Left notes at home	*					
Staying outside home, work (or driving by)		*	*	*	*	*
Waited around when you conversed w/person		*				
Showing up where you are	*	*	*	*		*

Visit at work	*		*		*	
Called at work	*					
Leaving items for you to find		*		*		
Communicating verbally against your will			*			*
Damaging your property	*	*	*	*	*	*
Do unrequested favors				*C		
Family contact			*			
Ask others about you	*		*	*	*	
Knocked on your window	*					
Ask out as friends				*C		
Ask out on a date				*C		
Threaten or release harmful information about you			*			
Find your info				*		
Take up an activity to be closer to you				*		
Manipulate into dating				*		
Scare you				*		*
Secretly taking belongings			*	*	*	*
Give unusual parcels				*		
Attempt to, or verbally abuse you				*		
Harass you				*		
Broke into house/car		*	*			
Visited your home	*		*		*	
Threaten or attempt to hurt you	*		*	*	*	
Physically violent to you	*			*		
Threaten emotional harm				*		
Threaten or attempt to hurt someone you know				*	*	* *

Threaten or harm pet		*	*	
Force sexual contact	*	*	*	
Took photos of you	*			
Release harmful info		*		
Kidnap you		*		
Use profanity about you	*			
Argue in public places	*			
Spread false rumors	*			
Claim to still be in relationship	*			
Violate restraining order				*
Will not take hints he/ she was not welcome	*			
Tried to keep you away from the opposite sex				*
Harm new partner or their property			*	*
Threaten to hurt him/herself			*	*
Told others stories about you	*	*		
Constantly apologize for past wrongs	*			
Exaggerated claims of affection for you	*			*
Described acts of sex to you	*			

C&S = Cupah & Spitzberg; T&T = Tjaden & Thoennes; L-R = Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al.; S&F = Sinclair & Frieze (*C = "Normal" courtship approach behavior); LLW = Logan, Leukefeld & Walker; DAA = Davis, Ace & Andra.