

Running Head: STALKING AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE

Perpetration of Stalking and Psychological Abuse:

Gender, Anger-Jealousy, and Personality Factors

Joanna Shuk-Nga Lau and Keith E. Davis

University of South Carolina, Columbia

Department of Psychology
University of South Carolina
1512 Pendleton St.
Columbia, SC 29208

Phone: (803) 777-4639

Fax: (803) 777-9558

E-mail: lauj@webmail.sc.edu

Daviske@sc.edu

Abstract

Two dimensions (pursuit and physical threat) of stalking behaviors as assessed by the Obsessive Relational Pursuit Inventory (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1999) and psychological abuse (dominance/isolation and emotional/verbal) and their predictors were examined in a sample of 164 college women and 119 men. Stalking and psychological abuse were strongly related for men but not for women. Women reported lower levels of stalking but not psychological abuse. For men, stalking and abuse were significantly correlated with anger-jealousy, lack of forgiveness, and lack of emotional intelligence, and high Macho scores. For women, anger-jealousy, forgiveness, and Macho were correlated with psychological abuse but not with stalking.

Keywords: Violence, Gender differences, Personality

Perpetration of stalking and psychological abuse: Gender, anger-jealousy, and personality factors

After a period in which the major focus of research on the abuse of women and intimate partner violence was on the prevalence and consequences of physical violence and rape (Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980; Russell, 1982), research has begun to include stalking and psychological abuse (Tajden & Thoennes, 2000; Tolman, 1999). This shift represents a conceptual broadening of the facets of violence (White, Kolwalski, Lyndon, & Valentine, 2000) and a growing recognition of the negative health and mental health consequences of being psychologically abused and/or being stalked by a(n ex-) partner (Davis, Coker, Sanderson, 2002; Mullen, Pathe, & Purcell, 2001).

Our goals in this study were 1) to examine the relationships among aspects of stalking and psychological abuse, 2) to explore the utility of a predictive model of stalking and abuse that builds on characteristics previously shown to be predictive of physical violence and rape, and 3) to investigate gender differences in these behaviors. Fisher and colleagues (2000) examined the prevalence rates of stalking among college students. In a probability sample of two and four female college students and a probability sample of female students enrolled in a set of selected colleges, Fisher and associates (2000) found the prevalence rate of stalking at 13.1% during a 7-month period. Other studies that have employed convenience college samples have also yielded similar and/or higher rates of stalking (e.g., Davis, Ace, & Andra, 2000; Logan, Leukefeld, & Walker, 2000).

The conception and measurement of stalking and psychological abuse

A small set of studies shows that stalking victimization is correlated with psychological abuse victimization (Logan et al. 2000; Mechanic, Weaver, and Resick, 2000; Tjaden &

Thoennes, 1998). Women who reported that a former intimate partner had stalked them often reported that their partner also had emotionally abused or controlled them (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). Fewer studies have examined the stalking perpetration and the psychological abuse of partners from the perpetrator's perspective, but they agree in suggesting that stalking and psychological abuse are part of the same syndrome (Davis et al. 2000; Dye & Davis, 2003; & Logan et al., 2000). One purpose of this study is to refine and improve the measurement of these two concepts and to examine their degree of interrelationship.

The definitions and characteristics of stalking as a legal concept and obsessive relational intrusion (ORI) overlap but are not identical. Stalking is defined as “willful, malicious, and repeated following and harassing of another person that threatens his or her safety” (Meloy & Gothard, 1995). As Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) have noted, to qualify as stalking in a legal sense, the victim must have been repeatedly subjected to the unwanted behaviors and must feel afraid. ORI is the “repeated unwanted pursuit and invasion of one’s sense of physical and symbolic privacy by another person, either stranger or acquaintance, who desires and/or presumes an intimate relationship” (Cupach & Spitzberg, 1998, pp. 234-235). Thus victims of ORI might merely perceive the stalking-like behaviors as annoying, not necessarily as threatening or frightening that would be necessary to qualify for stalking in a legal sense (Spitzberg & Cupach, 2001). Cupach and Spitzberg (1998) developed the ORI scale to assess a set of distinct stalking-like behaviors in an effort to improve the assessment of stalking victimization among college students. Originally a victim measure, the ORI scale has since been transformed into a perpetrator measure. The ORI-perpetration scale (Cupach & Spitzberg, 1998) is a one of the most comprehensive measures of stalking-like behaviors because it samples a wide range of behaviors from the milder to the highly threatening and aggressive forms. In our

view, the ORI-perpetrator scale and the Unwanted Pursuit Behavior Inventory (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Palaera, Cohen, & Rholing, 2000) were the two most promising comprehensive assessments. We chose the ORI scale because in our pretests we found that participants found it somewhat easier to acknowledge stalking-like behaviors.

A series of unpublished studies (e.g., Spitzberg & Cupach, 1999; Dutton-Greene & Winstead, 2004; Montero, 2002) have examined the factor structure of the ORI perpetration scale, and generally, the findings suggest that a two-factor solution most adequately describes these diverse behaviors. Because these studies are currently unpublished, one of our goals is to replicate the factor structure of the ORI as a measure of perpetration. Across the studies, the milder forms of ORI items consistently mapped onto one factor which we labeled *Pursuit/persistence*: 1) sending unwanted gifts; 2) sending unwanted messages; 3) exaggerated affection; 4) following around; 5) intruding into interactions; 6) invading personal space; 7) involving them in activities; 8) invading personal property; 9) intruding on friends/family; 10) monitoring, and 11) obtaining private information. The other factor, labeled *Physical threats/harassment*, includes more violent and threatening behaviors: 1) physically restraining; 2) regulatory harassment; 3) stealing/damaging possessions; 4) threatening to hurt self; 5) threatening others; 6) verbally threatening them; 7) threatening objects; 8) intruding in threatening ways; 9) sexually coercing; 10) physically threatening; 11) physically hurt; 12) kidnapping/physically constraining, and 13) physically endangering. We will examine the replicability of these two factors in this study.

Psychological abuse. Dye and Davis (2003) transformed Tolman's (1999) Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory into a perpetrator measure and extracted a two-factor solution, labeled *Emotional/verbal abuse* and *Dominance/isolation*. The Emotional/verbal abuse

factor consists of behaviors such as name-calling and verbal offenses, which are intended to depreciate a partner's self-esteem and hurt his/her feelings. The Dominance/isolation factor includes, but not limited to, a set of behaviors that is intimidating and threatening and is usually directed toward gaining and maintaining control over partners. This distinction among aspects of psychological abuse is consistent with ones suggested by other investigators (Coker, Davis, Arias, et al., 2002; Tolman, 1999).

Predictors of Stalking and Abuse

The third goal of this study is to evaluate the contribution of a set of situationally induced emotional states and personality characteristics to the prediction of stalking and psychological abuse. In previous studies, anger-jealousy, emotional intelligence, forgiveness, Macho, and emotional empathy have been established correlates of physical aggression in general and toward intimate partners. In this study, we plan to assess the relationships between these correlates and the perpetration of stalking and of psychological abuse. With the exceptions noted below, most of the predictors have not previously been investigated as predictors of stalking and psychological abuse.

Anger-jealousy. State anger and jealousy have consistently predicted stalking and psychological abuse in the context of breakup (Davis et al., 2000; Dye & Davis, 2003; Montero, 2002). Often the rejected, especially if he/she had an intimate relationship with the initiator, experiences high level of anger-jealousy after the rejection (Mullen, Pathe, & Purcell, 2001), making them likely to stalk (Davis et al., 2000; Dye & Davis, 2003; Montero, 2002). Thus we anticipate that being angry toward and feelings jealous about the partner will trigger both psychological abuse and stalking.

Forgiveness. The role of forgiveness has never been examined with respect to stalking and psychologically abusive behaviors. McCullough and his colleagues (1997) found that forgiving people are more motivated to pursue relationship-constructive, rather than relationship-destructive, acts toward their offenders. Unforgiving people are more likely to seek retribution from their offenders (McCullough, 2000). In this study, we used the Forgiveness Personality Inventory (Jones, Iver, & Lawler, 2003) to assess trait forgiveness. We hypothesized that lack of forgiveness would be predictive of stalking and psychological abuse.

Emotional intelligence. In the present study, we have adopted Schutte and her associates' (Schutte, et al., 1998) definition of emotional intelligence, as the ability and tendency to appraise, express, perceive, understand, and regulate emotions adaptively in one's self and in others. Emotional intelligence is associated with positive interpersonal characteristics and success in relationships (Schutte, et al., 2001). The clinical-forensic literature suggests that some stalkers are characterized by low interpersonal skills and a lack of insight into the impact of their behavior on their victims (Mullen, Pathe, & Purcell, 2001). Thus, we anticipate that emotional intelligence will be negatively correlated with perpetration of both stalking and psychological abuse.

Empathy. Sexually aggressive and coercive men, compared to nonaggressive men, have lower capacity for empathy, which is an ability to evaluate the expressed feelings of others in one's own interpretation and affective reaction (Lisak & Ivan, 1995). Thornton, Todd and Thorton (1996) found that emotionally un-empathic men could not distinguish between those sexual approaches which women found distressing vs. acceptable and did not recognize the abusive quality of their sexually aggressive behaviors. In this study, we speculated that

emotional empathy would be negatively associated with the perpetration of stalking and psychological abuse for both men and women.

Macho. Using the Expanded Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1986), White (1997) created a variable called Macho to assess a person's total negative masculinity. In her study, White (1997) found that during adolescence, men who are high on Macho accounted for 65% of self-report of attempted and completed rapes, whereas men who are low on Macho accounted for 15%. Because negative masculinity appeared to be related to hostility toward women, we suspected that the endorsement and approval of a negative masculine attitude would predict the perpetration of stalking and psychological abuse among men but not necessarily among women.

Gender Differences

With respect to the outcomes variables—stalking and psychological abuse, previous studies have not typically found differences in self-reported behaviors. The perpetrator's perspective, however, does contrast with victim reports, where both men and women reported more perpetration by men (Tajden & Thoennes, 1998). With respect to the predictor variables, many of these have previously found gender differences in which men were lower in emotional intelligence (Schutte et al., 1998), emotional empathy (Mehrabian, 2000), and higher in Macho (Spence, et al., 1986). The anger-jealousy variable has not, however, shown gender differences in previous studies (Davis, et al., 2000).

Because several of our predictor variables seem particularly relevant to male aggressiveness and urges to control partner, we anticipated that we would achieve a higher level of predicting male stalking and psychological abuse than of female stalking and abuse.

Method

Participants

Students enrolled in Psychology 101, and advanced psychology and criminal justice courses at the University of South Carolina's Columbia were recruited for the study. With the stipulation that they either had to have at least one dating relationship that lasted for at least 3 months and which ended in a breakup, or had been rejected by someone with whom they wanted a relationship, a total of 283 (119 males and 164 females). 79% were White and 14% were African-American and the majority of the subjects were juniors and seniors (83%). Also, 97% reported that they were heterosexual. All participants signed an informed consent and had the opportunity to withdraw from any or all portions of the study at any time without penalty. In return for participating in the study, the students received either class credit or an excused absent in their class. The participants received a debriefing statement that explained the purpose of the study and provided a list of references at the end of the session.

Measures

The participants were asked to complete a demographic questionnaire and these following questionnaires:

Anger-Jealousy scale (Davis et al., 2000) is a composite of five items- anger, upset, jealous, letdown, and vengeful, assessing the participant's degree of anger-jealousy to a breakup. The items are arranged on a 5-point Likert scale, with 5 being "very much" and 1 being "not at all." Higher total scores imply a greater level of anger/jealousy. The scale's alpha level was .82 in this study.

Emotional Intelligence: Assessing Emotion Scale (Shutte et al., 2001) is a 33-item self-report inventory assesses an individual's current level to perceive, understand, regulate and

harness emotions adaptively. Sample items included “I know when to speak about my personal problems to others” and “I find it hard to understand the non-verbal messages of other people.”

A single total score for the scale was derived from the summation of all items. Alpha level of this scale was .92 in this sample.

Forgiving Personality Inventory (Jones, Iyer & Lawler, 2003) is a 33-item self-report inventory that measures participants’ tendency to forgive offenses inflicted by others as well as the dispositional tendency to not to be offended. Some items of the scale were “I believe in the importance of forgiveness” and “If my romantic partner wrongs me, I tend to hold a grudge.[reverse scored]” The internal consistency was .92.

Balanced Emotional Empathy Scale (BEES) (Mehrabian, 2000) is a 30-item scale assessing emotional empathy. The items were arranged on a 9-point agree-disagree scale, with 15 items worded positively and 15 items worded negatively to reduce acquiescence bias. The total score for emotional empathy was calculated by subtracting the sum of the negatively worded items from the sum of the positively worded items. Alpha level for the positively worded items was .80 and for the negatively worded items was .86 in this sample.

Extended Personal Attribute Questionnaire, EPAQ (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1986) is a 40-item inventory assesses a range of a person’s desirable and undesirable stereotypical agentic masculine characteristics and stereotypical communion feminine characteristics. A score for Macho, sum of person’s undesirable negative agentic, masculine characteristics, is derived from the difference between the M- and F+ subscales of the EPAQ. M- measures a person’s degree of negatively toned agentic, masculine characteristics and F+ measures a person’s degree of positively toned communion, feminine characteristics. Alpha for the M- scale was .74 and for the F+ scale was .77.

Obsessive Relational Intrusion--Pursuit form) (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1999) is a 24-item questionnaire in which respondents are asked to endorse items on a 5 point scale. The instructions for the items read as follows: *In your lifetime, how often, if at all, have you ever persistently pursued someone over a period of time for the purpose of establishing some form of intimate relationships that this person did not want, by [the specific behavior]. Each behavior is treated as representative of a category, i.e., Leaving unwanted messages, e.g., notes, cards, letters, voice-mail, e-mail, messages with friends, etc.* The specific behaviors, without their elaborations, are listed in Table 1, which contains the factor loadings of these items.

We anticipated that two factors would emerge from the analysis: Pursuit/persistence and Physical threat/harassment. (e.g., pursuit/persistence items included “sending unwanted gifts” and physical threat/harassment items included “physically restraining”). The coefficient alpha for pursuit/persistence was .84 and physical threat/harassment was .93 in this sample.

Psychological Maltreatment Scale (Dye & Davis, 2003). Dye and Davis transformed the original short 14-item Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory (Tolman, 1999), which originally assesses victims’ experiences of partner’s maltreatment and abuse, to an inventory measuring participants’ perpetrations of psychological and emotional abuse. Following Tolman (1999), two subscales were derived which had good internally consistency; alpha for Dominance/isolation was .75 and for Emotional/verbal abuse was .83 in this sample.

Results

Data Screening

Following the recommendations of Tabachnick and Fidell (1996), we examined our data for normality, linearity, and kurtosis prior to analyses. All of the variables except for the Physical Threat/harassment ORI factor were within acceptable limits. For our correlational and

regression analyses, we did a square root transformation of this variable to reduce its skewness and kurtosis, but its raw score means and standard deviations are reported in tables with the other variables.

Types of ORI Behaviors Reported

Consistent with other studies of stalking perpetration, participants in this study acknowledged engaging in a wide range of behaviors that could qualify as stalking. Out of the total sample of 283, 29 (10.3%) participants admitted that they had persistently followed and/or harassed someone in their lifetime, and but only 3 participants considered their behaviors to be stalking. 60 participants reported leaving unwanted gifts, 95 reported leaving unwanted messages, 76 reported making exaggerated expressions of affection, 50 reported following their victims around, 40 reported intruding uninvited into their interactions, 40 reported invading their personal space, 16 reported involving them in activities in unwanted ways, 24 reported invading their personal property, 42 reported intruding upon their friends, family or coworkers, 69 reported monitoring them and/or their behavior, and 44 reported covertly obtaining private information at least once or more. 17 participants reported physically restraining their victims, 5 reported regulatory harassment, 13 reported stealing or damaging their valued possessions, 13 reported threatening to hurt themselves, 7 reported threatening others who they care about, 17 reported verbally threatening them personally, 6 reported leaving or sending them threatening objects, 13 reported showing at places in threatening ways, 14 reported sexually coercing them, 10 reported physically threatening them, 22 reported physically hurting them, 5 reported kidnapping or physically constraining them, and 5 reported physically endangering their life at least once or more.

Factor analysis of the ORI. A principal-components Varimax (orthogonal) rotation factor analysis was performed for the ORI scale and a two-factor solution was extracted. Alternative one-factor and three-factor solutions were considered, but neither fit the data as well as the two-factor solution. The eigenvalue of the two-factor solution was 48.2. Following Montero (2002), who had used an oblique rotational method, we expected to find that 11 of the ORI items would load on the milder, *Pursuit/persistence* factor and 13 on the more aggressive *Physical threat/harassment* factor. As can be seen in Table 1, the data were consistent with our expectations. With eleven items loading onto Pursuit/persistence, it has an eigenvalue of 30.76. Two of the items, 7 & 8, loaded on both factor 1 and 2 and could have been deleted for the sake of factorial purity, but we decided to retain them on factor 1 because they had loaded clearly (without overlap) in Montero's analysis. The second factor was labeled Physical threat/harassment consisting of 13 of the more severe stalking behaviors that involve some threat to the physical or emotional integrity of the victim (e.g., physically restraining them, verbally threatening them personally, and physically hurting them). Physical threat/harassment had an eigenvalue of 17.49 and 13 items. All the items had a loading of at least 0.50. The results of this analysis are consistent with that of Dutton-Greene and Winstead (2004), who found two clear factors, which they labeled Pursuit and Aggression. Somewhat more of the 24 items were factorially complex in their analyses so that they retain only 8 items each to define these factors. Each set of eight items overlaps with the appropriate set of 11 and 13 items that we retained in this study.

Gender Differences

Gender differences (See Table 2) had been expected for many of the personality based predictors but not for the criterion variables. Significant gender differences appeared among

most of the predictor variables including trait forgiveness ($t(279)= 3.17, p<.01$), emotional empathy ($t(280)= 12.19, p=.001$), emotional intelligence ($t(277)= 5.11, p=.001$) and degree of macho ($t(280)=6.69, p=.001$). As expected the degree of anger-jealousy did not differ by gender.

Somewhat to our surprise, men engaged in more Pursuit/persistence behaviors ($t(277)= 3.89, p=.01$) and more Physical threat/harassment behaviors ($t(277)= 2.00, p<.05$) than women. As expected, gender differences were not confirmed in the perpetration of psychological abuse: Emotional/verbal abuse ($t(278)= 1.26, ns$) and Dominance/isolation ($t(277)= -1.37, ns$).

Correlations among stalking and psychological abuse measures. Because it is quite possible that the degree of relationship among these four measures might vary by gender, we examined the sets of four correlations separately. As can be seen in Table 3, the patterns of correlations suggest a stronger connection between stalking and psychological abuse among men than among women, therefore we explicitly tested the differences. The four correlations for men, which ranged from $r= .39$ to $.43$, were transformed to z -scores and then averaged ($z=.44$), and the same was done for the women, which they ranged from $r=.04$ to $.20$. The average z -score for women was $.14$. Using Cohen & Cohen's (1983) procedures for testing the differences between independent correlations, the results showed that men's scores on the ORI and psychological abuse correlations were significantly more positively related than women's ($z= 2.47, p<.01$).

Correlates of Stalking and Psychological Abuse

With five predictor variables and four criterion variables, we have 20 separate correlations predicted for each gender. Among men, 14 of the 20 were statistically significant in the predicted directions and five other correlations were in the predicted direction but attained only the $p <.10$ level of significance. The story among women was much different. Only six of

the 20 predictions were supported, and all of these concerned psychological abuse. None of the ten predictions about stalking perpetration were supported. The failure to find any relationships among the predictors and stalking measures for women may reflect substantive differences in the relevance of the predictor variables but may also be due to the restricted range of scores on both stalking variables for women. The standard deviations, after transformation, were almost twice as large for men as for women. Specific predictions and results follow below (See Table 3).

Men's level of state anger-jealousy was significantly positively correlated with Pursuit/persistence and Physical threat/harassment, with Dominance/isolation psychological abuse, but only marginally with Emotional/verbal abuse ($r=.14, p<.07$). For women, state anger-jealousy, although positive related to all criterion variables, was significantly related only to Dominance/isolation. Men's emotional intelligence was significantly negatively correlated with all stalking and psychological abuse measures. For women emotional intelligence was significantly negatively related to Dominance/isolation of partner. Men's forgiveness scores were significantly negatively related to Pursuit/persistence, to both Emotional/verbal abuse and Dominance/isolation abuse, and marginally to Physical threat/harassment ($r=-.15, p<.06$). For the females, forgiveness was significantly negatively correlated with both psychological abuse scales but not significantly with the stalking measures. Men's emotional empathy was significantly correlated with the Emotional/verbal abuse scale, but marginally correlated with Dominance/isolation and Pursuit/persistence, and not at all with physical threat/harassment. For women, their level of emotional empathy was not significantly correlated with stalking or psychological abuse. Finally, the results indicated that men's degree of Macho was significantly positively correlated with both factors of psychological abuse and to Physical threat/harassment. The correlation between men's Macho and Pursuit/persistence was in the predicted direction but

marginal, ($r=.12$, $p < .09$). Significant positive relationships were found between women's degree of Macho and both factors of psychological abuse, but not with the stalking factors.

Because most of the predictors had not been examined in the same study, we had little a priori based for expecting which would be most powerful in predicting the stalking and psychological abuse outcomes. A series of hierarchical regressions were performed separately by gender to evaluate the strength of each predictor. For men's Pursuit/persistence, anger-jealousy toward partner was the only significant predictor. For Physical threat/harassment, high levels of anger-jealousy and low emotional intelligence were significant predictors, and lack of forgiveness was a marginal contributor ($p < .104$). For women, none of the predictors accounted for significant variance in either stalking factor. In the case of psychological abuse, men's and women's patterns were similar. Lack of forgiveness was a significant predictor of Emotional/verbal abuse for both men and women. Lack of forgiveness and anger-jealousy toward partner were significant predictors of Dominance/isolation for both men and women. In the case of men's Dominance/isolation, low emotional intelligence made a marginal contribution to prediction ($p < .07$).

Discussion

We had four goals in conducting this study and progress was made on each goal. First, we factor analyzed the ORI items and extracted a two-factor solution that distinguishes two types of stalking-like behaviors: Pursuit/persistence and Physical threat/harassment. These findings are consistent with those of three other, as yet unpublished studies (Dutton-Greene & Winstead, 2004; Montero, 2002; and Spitzberg & Cupach, 1999), each of which has obtained two highly similar factors. These findings support the view that the ORI perpetration measure is best conceptualized as tapping two broad sets of behaviors, one of which primary reflects persistence

and pursuit of a current or former intimate partner and the other of which reflects a much more aggressive pattern of relating to desired or former partners. Having a well-designed measure that makes these clear distinctions is important because the psychological consequences to victims should vary and because the opportunities to intervene with perpetrators may also vary by types of behaviors engaged in.

A second goal was to examine how closely related the measures of stalking and psychological abuse were. Six of eight intercorrelations between stalking and psychological abuse were significant. Men who psychologically abused their partners were much more likely to acknowledge both kinds of stalking than were women. For women, if they engaged in pursuit/persistence, they were somewhat likely to engage in both kinds of abuse, but again not to the degree that men who engaged in pursuit did ($z = 2.16, p < .02$). Physical threat/harassment stalking was unrelated to psychological abuse for women. The patterns of correlations between stalking and partner abuse among men vs. women may be attributable entirely to the restricted range of stalking measures for women, but it is worth briefly exploring substantive alternatives. Two studies in which restriction of range in the stalking measures was not a problem, both found that psychological abuse and stalking were more strongly related among men than among women (Dye & Davis, 2003; Logan et al., 2000). Logan et al. did not report a statistical test of the differences but psychological abuse perpetration and stalking perpetration were correlated $+ .56$ among men ($N = 46$) but only $+ .13$ among women ($N = 84$). These correlations are significantly different from each other via Cohen & Cohen's (1983) z -score test ($z = 2.66, p < .01$). They also found a much stronger reciprocity effect for both psychological abuse and for stalking among men than among women. Men who saw themselves as psychologically abused were much more likely to be abusers ($r = .88$ vs. $.45, z = 5.23, p < .001$) and men who saw

themselves as being stalking victims were much more likely to stalk than were women ($r = .84$ vs. $.23$, $z = 5.81$, $p < .001$; Logan et al, 2000, p. 99). Hines and Saudino (2003) also report stronger interrelationships among several aspects of physical, psychological, and sexual aggression for men than for women in their sample of college dating students.

One interpretation of these several studies is that, in some contexts, men both report provocations such as their own victimization to justify their aggression and are more prone to a broad range abusive and controlling behaviors. Women, in contrast, are known to be more selective in how they respond to provocation partially out of concern for the consequences of provoking their intimate partners and also because some types of behaviors would be less effective coming from a woman. Physical threats of various sorts might be less credible to male partners than male threats would be. An important step in clarifying the meaning of the gender differences above would be the collection of qualitative data of the sort directed at the question: “What is the person doing by doing that?” The question of the significance of the stalking and abusive behaviors to the perpetrators needs attention that it has not thus far received in this literature. In an as yet-unpublished study of female stalking victimization and perpetration in a community sample of women in violent relationships, female stalking perpetration was predicted primarily by jealousy motives, arising out of concern over the partner’s infidelity, rather than out of motives to harm, control, or defend oneself from the partner’s violence (Swan & Davis, 2004).

Predictors of men’s stalking and psychological abuse. Much of previous research on IPV has been guided by attachment theory and love-styles theory supplemented by a recognition that abusive males were often described as controlling of partners and prone to jealousy (Dye & Davis, 2003; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Palaera, Cohen, & Rohling, 2000; and Sinclair & Frieze, 2000). We reasoned that the attachment insecurity, need for control account while genuine was

not the whole story. Thus we wanted to explore the role of new personal dispositions that theoretically should be related to stalking and abuse, but which had not been examined. Both of the major typological analyses of stalkers have noted that a subset seemed socially immature and lack in insight about the impact of their behaviors upon the person being pursued (Mullen, Path, & Purcell, 2001; Sheridan & Boon, 200x). This led us to examine a well-developed measure of emotional intelligence (Schette, et al., 2001) reasoning that a lack of emotional intelligence could be part of the reason for the social immaturity and interpersonal blindness seen in the clinical-forensic cases. Another possible contributor to abuse might be a strong tendency not to see the importance of forgiveness in intimate relationships. Our data support the importance of both of these variables in the prediction of men's stalking and abuse. Lack of forgiveness is the strongest predictor of both psychological abuse measures, and it contributed marginally to the prediction of Physical threat/harassment stalking. Although emotional intelligence was significantly related to all four measures in the zero-order correlations, only its regression on Physical threat/harassment stalking and Dominance/isolation abuse ($p < .07$) were significant in the regression analyses. The Macho variable, which was significantly related to three of the four stalking and abuse measures, was however, very strongly negatively correlated with forgiveness ($r = -.59, p < .001$) and it made no independent contribution to prediction of any of the stalking and abuse measures after its relationship to forgiveness was controlled.

The prediction of women's stalking and psychological abuse. We had no success predicting stalking for this sample of women. Even anger-jealousy, which had been predictive in several previous samples (Davis, et al., 2000; Dye & Davis, 2003) was not significantly related in this sample. The low variances of the stalking scores for women in this sample was undoubtedly part of the reason, but it may be the case that the variables selected were more

relevant to men. In the case, however, of psychological abuse, the pattern of predictors for women was similar to that for men in two ways. Forgiveness was strongly negatively related to both types and anger/jealousy was positively related—significantly so for Dominance/isolation abuse. The more Macho the women, the more likely they were to engage in both forms of abuse, but this relationship did not retain significance in the regression analysis. Clearly the lack of capacity to forgive in relationships is an important component of the existence of psychological abuse and stalking. The results were not quite so clear-cut for emotional intelligence, but it is an important potential part of the story about men's stalking.

Limitations. This study was a cross-sectional, self-report study of having engaged in psychological abuse and stalking-like behaviors in previous dating relationships. Although the data were collected under conditions of complete anonymity, the participants may well have under-reported some of the more abusive and threatening behaviors. Certainly we cannot claim to support specific causal interpretations of the correlations reported.

Future research on this topic would benefit from being able to follow couples through time to obtain contemporaneous reports of abusive behaviors and to include partner's behaviors and reactions to self's behavior for a fuller story in the development both of stalking and abuse. Also the collection of qualitative data from participants designed to get at what they hoped to achieve by their behaviors and how they interpreted the responses of their partner/victims would be a contribution.

In conclusion, we have provided support for the analysis of the ORI perpetration scale as measuring two-dimensions of stalking behavior: Pursuit/persistence and Physical threat/harassment. We have shown that dimensions of stalking and psychological abuse are strongly connected for men but much less so for women. We have replicated the importance of

anger-jealousy as a predictor of stalking and abuse, and provided evidence that two dispositions—forgiveness and emotional intelligence—are promising predictors of stalking and psychological abuse. The observed gender differences in degree of stalking and its prediction remain to be explained.

References

- Cohen, J. & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied Multiple Regression/Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cupach, W. R., & Spitzberg, B.H. (1998). Obsessional relational intrusions and stalking. In B. H. Spitzberg & W. R. Cupach (Eds.), *The Dark Side of Close Relationships* (pp. 233-263). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Davis, K. E., Ace, A., & Andra, M. (2000). Stalking perpetrators and psychological maltreatment of partners: Attachment insecurity, need for control, and breakup context. *Violence and Victims, 15*, 407-425.
- Davis, K. E., Coker, A. L., & Sanderson, M. (2002). Physical and mental effects of being stalked for men and women. *Violence and Victims, 17*, 429-443.
- Dutton-Greene, L. B., & Winstead, B. A. (2004). Predicting obsessive relational intrusion: An investigation of attachment, relationship satisfaction, relationship alternatives, and breakup distress. *Journal for Social and Personal Relationships*. (in press).
- Dye, M. & Davis, K.E. (2003). Stalking and emotional abuse: Common factors and relationship-specific characteristics. *Violence and Victims, 18*, 163-180.
- Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). *Sexual victimization among college women: Results from two national-level studies*. Washington D.C.: National Institute of Justice.
- Follingstad, D. R., Bradley, Helff, C. M, & R. G., Laughlin, J. E., (2002). A model for predicting dating violence: Anxious attachment, anger temperament, and need for relationship control. *Violence & Victims, 17*, 35-48.

- Hines, D. A. & Saudino, K. J. (2003). Gender differences in psychological, physical, and sexual aggression among college students using the revised Conflict Tactics Scales. *Violence and Victims, 18*, 197-217.
- Jones, W. H., Iyer, V., & Lawler, K. (2003). Assessing forgiveness as a dimension of personality. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Langhinrichsen–Rohling, J., Palaera, R. E., Cohen, J., & Rohling, M. L. (2000). Breaking up is hard to do: Pursuit behaviors following the dissolution of romantic relationships. *Violence and Victims, 15*, 73-90.
- Lisak, D., & Ivan, C. (1995). Deficits in intimacy and empathy in sexually aggressive men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 10*, 296-308.
- Logan, T. K., Leukefeld, C., & Walker, B. (2000). Stalking as a variant of intimate violence: Implications from a young adult sample. *Violence and Victims, 15*, 91-111.
- Marolla, J. & Scully, D. (1986). Attitudes toward women, violence, and rape: A comparison of convicted rapists and other felons. *Deviant Behavior, 7*, 337-355.
- McCullough, M. (2000). Forgiveness as human strength: Theory, measurement, links to Well-being. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 19*, 43-55.
- McCullough, M. E., Worthington, E. L., Jr., & Rachel, K. C. (1997). Interpersonal forgiving in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 321-336.
- Mechnaic, M. B. (2002). Stalking victimization: Clinical implications for assessment and intervention. In K. E. Davis, I. H. Frieze, and R. Maiuro (Eds.), *Stalking: Perspectives on victims and perpetrators* (pp. 31-61). New York: Springer Publishing Co.

- Mechanic, M.B., Weaver, T. L., & Resick, P. A. (2000) Intimate partner violence and stalking behavior: Exploration of patterns and correlates in a sample of a acutely battered women. *Violence and Victims, 15*, 55-71.
- Mehrabian, A. (2000). *Manual for the Balance Emotional Empathy Scale (BEES)*. (Available from Albert Mehrabian, 1130 Alta Mesa Road, Monterey, CA 93940.
- Meloy, J. R., & Gothard, S. (1995). A demographic and clinical comparison of obsessional followers and offenders with mental disorders. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 152*, 258-263.
- Montero, S. M. (2002). *Personality characteristics of perpetrators of stalking-like behaviors*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Mullen, P.E., Pathe, M., & Purcell, R. (2001). Stalking: New constructions of human behaviour. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry. 35*, 9-16.
- Pathe, M. & Mullen, P.E (1997). The impact of stalkers and their victims. *British Journal of Psychiatry. 170*, 12-17.
- Russell, D. E. H. (1982). The prevalence and incidence of forcible rape of females. *Victimology, 7*, 81-93.
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C. J. & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 25*, 167-177.
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Bobik, C., Coston T. D., Greeson, C., Jedlicka, C., Rhodes, E., & Wendorf, G. (2001). Emotional intelligence and interpersonal relations. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 141*, 523-536.

- Sinclair, H. C. & Frieze, I. H. (2000). Initial courtship behavior and stalking: How should we draw the line? *Violence and Victims, 15*, 23-29.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L., & Stapp, J. (1986). The Personal Attributes Questionnaire: A measure of sex-role stereotypes and masculinity- femininity. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 4(42)* MS #617.
- 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.
- Spitzberg, B.H. & Cupach, W. R. (2001, Feb). *Power, empathy, and sex role ideology as predictors of obsessive relational intrusion*. Paper presented at the Western States Communication Association conference, Coeur d'Alene, Id.
- Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). *Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family*. Garden City, N. Y.: Anchor Press.
- Swan, S. & Davis, K. E. (2004). [Stalking victimization and perpetration in a community sample of women]. Unpublished data raw data.
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics*. New York: HarperCollins College Publishers.
- Thorton, S., Todd, B., & Thornton, D. (1996). Empathy and the recognition of abuse. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 1*, 147-153.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1998). *Stalking in America: Findings from the national violence against women survey*. : National Institute of Justice and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (NCJ 169592).

- Tjaden, P. & Thoennes, N. (2000). *Full report of the prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice, (Report No. NCJ 183781).
- Tolman, R. M. (1999). The validation of the psychological maltreatment of women inventory. *Violence and Victims, 14*, 25-37.
- White, J. W. (1997, March). *Time and time again: Sexual assault victimization and revictimization*. Presidential Talk, Southeastern Psychological Association, Atlanta, GA.
- White, J. W., Kolwalski, R. M., Lyndon, A., & Valentine, S. (2000). An integrative contextual developmental model of male stalking. *Violence and Victims, 15*, 373-380.

Table 1. *Factor Loadings of ORI Items.*

Behaviors engaged in	Pursuit/persistence	Physical threat/harassment
Leaving unwanted gifts	.528	.180
Leaving unwanted messages	.729	.004
Making exaggerated expressions of affection	.534	.009
Following them around	.658	.126
Intruding uninvited into their interactions	.730	.139
Invading their personal space	.534	.285
Involving them in activities in unwanted ways	.310	.455
Invading their personal property	.443	.424
Intruding upon friends and family	.571	.141
Monitoring them	.658	.205
Covertly obtaining private information	.510	.281
Physically restraining them	.185	.737
Regulatory harassment	.162	.780
Stealing or damaging valued possessions	.181	.757
Threatening to hurt yourself	.204	.625
Threatening others whom they care about	.167	.756
Verbally threatening personally	.237	.601
Leaving or sending them threatening objects	.128	.668
Showing up at places in threatening ways	.364	.641
Sexually coercing them	.270	.572
Physical threatening them	.176	.734
Physically hurting them	.112	.785
Kidnapping or physically constraining them	.138	.824
Physically endangering their life	.161	.793

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations of All Variables

	<u>Males</u>		<u>Females</u>		<u>Gender Differences</u>
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Anger/Jealousy	12.7	4.3	13.4	5.27	$t(268) = 1.26$, ns
Forgiveness	115.9	16.6	122.1	16.2	$t(279) = 3.17$, $p < .01$
Emotional empathy	21.2	27.5	58.8	24.1	$t(280) = 12.19$, $p < .01$
Emotional intelligence	121.3	16.2	130.6	14.3	$t(277) = 5.11$, $p < .01$
Macho	-8.21	6.7	-13.97	7.5	$t(280) = 6.69$, $p < .01$
Physical threats/harassment	1.88	6.04	0.69	1.98	$t(277) = 2.00$, $p < .05$
Pursuit/persistence	4.55	5.98	2.29	3.4	$t(277) = 3.89$, $p < .01$
Emotional/verbal	12.7	4.8	13.4	4.9	$t(278) = 1.26$, ns
Dominance/isolation	11.2	4.7	10.5	3.6	$t(277) = -1.37$, ns

Note. Ns for males ranged from 116 to 119 and for females from 156 to 163

Table 3. *Correlations among Predictors and Outcomes for Men and Women*

Subscale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Anger/jealousy	1.00	-.19*	.06	-.16*	.04	.14	.29**	.32**	.22**
2. Forgiveness	-.30**	1.00	.45**	.34**	-.59**	-.43**	-.41**	-.26**	-.15
3. Emotional empathy	.13	.28**	1.00	.39**	-.44**	-.23*	-.13	-.11	-.01
4. Emotional intelligence	-.05	.27**	.38**	1.00	-.35**	-.16*	-.29**	-.27**	-.20*
5. Macho	-.02	-.34**	-.52**	-.27**	1.00	.23**	.26**	.16*	.12
6. Emotional/verbal abuse	.12	-.36**	-.07	-.09	.25**	1.00	.52**	.42**	.39**
7. Dominance/isolation	.28**	-.30**	-.02	-.14*	.25**	.45**	1.00	.43**	.41**
8. Pursuit/Persistence	.08	-.05	.01	.10	-.03	.17*	.20**	1.00	.60**
9. Physical Threat/ Harassment	.10	-.03	.06	-.03	-.05	.04	.12	.40**	1.00

Note. Correlations above the diagonal are for men. *Ns* for men ranged from 116 to 119 for women from 156 to 163.

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

Table 4. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Predicting Stalking

Variable	<u>Pursuit/persistence</u>				<u>Males (N = 113)</u>				<u>Females (N = 153)</u>			
	B	SE B	β	ΔR^2	B	SE B	β	ΔR^2	B	SE B	β	ΔR^2
Anger	.009	.039	.208*	.057	.003	.019	.118	.013	.003	.019	.118	.013
Emotional Intelligence	-.002	.011	-.133	.021	.000	.007	-.031	.001	.000	.007	-.031	.001
Forgiveness	.000	.011	-.044	.002	.000	.006	.018	.000	.000	.006	.018	.000

Note. For males, adj. $R^2 = .054$ for step 3 ($p < .05$). For females, adj. $R^2 = -.006$ for step 3, ns. * $p < .05$.

Variable	<u>Physical threat/harassment</u>				<u>Males (N = 113)</u>				<u>Females (N = 153)</u>			
	B	SE B	β	ΔR^2	B	SE B	β	ΔR^2	B	SE B	β	ΔR^2
Anger	.101	.033	.269**	.107	.000	.010	.073	.007	.000	.010	.073	.007
Emotional Intelligence	-.002	.009	-.178*	.049	.000	.004	.113	.010	.000	.004	.113	.010
Forgiveness	-.001	.009	-.152#	.020	.000	.003	-.055	.003	.000	.003	-.055	.003

Note. For males, adj. $R^2 = .154$ for step 3 ($p < .001$). For females, adj. $R^2 = .00$ for step 3, ns. ** $< .01$, * $p < .05$, # $p = .104$.

Table 5. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Predicting Psychological Abuse

<u>Emotional/verbal abuse</u>		<u>Males (N = 111)</u>			<u>Females (N = 153)</u>			
Variable	B	SE B	β	ΔR^2	B	SE B	β	ΔR^2
Forgiveness	-.117	.030	-.391**	.194	-.113	.027	-.361**	.125
Emotional Intelligence	-.001	.018	-.075	.003	.000	.017	.033	.001
Anger	.009	.102	.080	.006	.001	.078	.012	.000

Note. For males, adj. $R^2 = .181$ for step 3 ($p < .001$). For females, adj. $R^2 = .109$ for step 3 ($p < .001$). ** $p < .01$

<u>Dominance/isolation</u>		<u>Males (N = 111)</u>			<u>Females (N = 153)</u>			
Variable	B	SE B	β	ΔR^2	B	SE B	β	ΔR^2
Forgiveness	-.009	.026	-.321**	.178	-.004	.019	-.202*	.082
Anger	.241	.094	.219**	.052	.146	.056	.209**	.039
Emotional Intelligence	-.004	.026	-.163#	.023	-.002	.020	-.080	.006

Note. For males, adj. $R^2 = .232$ for step 3 ($p < .001$). For females, adj. $R^2 = .109$ for step 3 ($p < .001$). ** $p \leq .01$, * $p < .05$, # $p = .07$