

Running head: Shame and stalking

Facing rejection: New relationships, broken relationships, shame and stalking

Abstract

This study provides a preliminary examination of the relationship between shame-proneness, emotions and persistent, unwanted courting or pursuit behaviour. Two hundred and twenty-two undergraduates completed a questionnaire measuring responses to the termination of a relationship or the declining of a date. The Test of Self-Conscious Affect (TOSCA; Tangney, Wagner & Gramzow, 1989) was used to measure shame. While shame was unrelated to types of intrusive behaviour, individuals who engaged more repetitively in covert pursuit tended to ruminate more over their love interest than those who rarely engaged in such behaviour. Rumination was positively correlated with shame. Self-harm behaviours and harm towards others were associated with feelings of sadness and depression, while those who engaged more often in harm towards others also reported feelings of anger and jealousy. Conclusions are made regarding the function of shame and other emotions in intrusive behaviour and their potential relevance to treatment of stalkers.

While forming and terminating relationships may be a common experience in human development, the way in which individuals respond in the face of rejection may differ markedly. Some individuals may move on to form new relationships, while others refuse to let go and make repeated attempts to rekindle the relationship or alternatively, punish the other party for their actions. In some circumstances, these unwanted and often persistent communications may constitute stalking. According to self-report studies, more females identify themselves as victims of stalking and males are more frequently identified as the perpetrator (e.g., Budd & Mattinson, 2000; Fisher, Cullen & Turner, 2002; Pathe & Mullen, 1997; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). However, some recent research suggests that both males and females engage in stalking behaviour (Sinclair & Frieze, 2000), but differences in perceptions of stalking and fear responses may lead to the behaviour of males being more likely to be construed as stalking (Davis & Frieze, 2000; Tjaden, Thoennes & Allison, 2000; Hills & Taplin, 1998; Dennison & Thomson, 2002).

When behaviour is identified as stalking, the majority of victims know the stalker (Pathe & Mullen, 1997). In a self-report study of stalking victimisation, Tjaden et al. (2000) reported that participants were more likely to define themselves as victims of stalking when a prior intimate partner engaged in the behaviour. Therefore it could be argued that much of what is perceived to be stalking occurs with the apparent motive to initiate a relationship or to reinstate a relationship. Emerson, Ferris and Gardner (1998) suggest much of what has come to be labelled as stalking has grown out of issues or complications involved in normal relationship processes. Indeed, typologies developed in the stalking literature include the *simple obsessional* (Zona, Palarea and Lane, 1998), where the victim and stalker have prior knowledge of each other, often in the form of a relationship, and the *rejected stalker* (Mullen, Pathe & Purcell, 2000) where the stalking is triggered by the breakdown of a close relationship and the aim of the behaviour could include reconciliation or revenge. While the

point at which such behaviour comes to be perceived as constituting stalking is not clearly identified and may differ in each circumstance, the forming of new relationships and ending existing relationships may be a context for persistent and unwanted communications.

Some support for the co-occurrence of stalking and relationship processes was found in a study of courtship behaviours and stalking in a college sample of men and women. Sinclair and Frieze (2000) reported that the majority of the sample, both men and women, engaged in behaviours that could be conceptualised as stalking, or at the very least 'pre-stalking', as a response to rejection from someone they loved. A similar study by Haugaard and Seri (2004) investigated intrusive contact among adolescents and adults, finding that 7% of females and 11% of males in the study acknowledged engaging in intrusive contact following the dissolution of a relationship. The authors did not find any differences between males and females for the type of intrusive contact initiated. However, the sample was too small (i.e., 37 females and 15 males who self-reported engaging in intrusive behaviour) to draw firm conclusions. Both of these studies were conducted in the United States, therefore we do not know whether the extent of intrusive behaviour is comparable to an Australian university or community population. Questions that emerge from the studies are whether, in contrast to self-report victim studies, males and females do in fact engage in similar levels of stalking, whether the stalking behaviours engaged in by males and females are the same, and why some individuals engage in such pursuit behaviour to the point where it may be construed as stalking?

Perhaps as a consequence of the swiftness of the introduction of stalking laws and the immediate need to assess and manage stalking, much of the research has taken place outside a coherent theory of the motivation and maintenance of stalking. Researchers are only beginning to consider the underlying dispositions of individuals who engage in the excessive unwanted pursuit of another and recognise that variations in normal dispositions and emotions

may provide a deeper understanding of why some people stalk. Identifying the conditions that promote and maintain stalking behaviour is essential if appropriate and effective intervention and prevention techniques are to be developed (Westrup and Fremouw, 1998).

Given that much of what has been coined stalking centers around the establishment or re-establishment of a relationship (e.g., Tjaden et al., 2000), recent research has begun to examine relationship, attachment and coping styles of people who stalk (e.g., Davis, Ace & Andra, 2000). This research has also examined the tendency of stalkers to experience anger and jealousy as a response to a relationship break-up. Davis et al. (2000) found that in a survey of college students, of those who reported engaging in stalking behaviours, the degree of stalking was associated with expressions of love and anger, jealousy and obsessiveness. The researchers also found that anxious attachment, anger-jealousy and the need for control were predictive of psychological maltreatment in relationships and stalking. Similarly, Mullen et al. (2000) suggest that jealousy and possessiveness are key characteristics of the rejected stalker. Davis et al. (2000) suggest that to understand stalking we need to focus on both the context of the break-up (such as who initiated it) and the personal dispositions of the stalker, particularly those that are related to relationship violence.

One dispositional emotion that has not previously been examined in relation to stalking is shame. The shame and guilt-proneness of certain individuals and groups has been widely researched by June Tangney, who sees these emotions from a functionalist perspective, as they directly influence behaviour and the quality of interpersonal relationships and interactions (Tangney, 2001). She asserts that an individual experiencing guilt will view the act or transgression itself as being “bad” (Tangney, 1995). This allows him or her to make attempts to correct the wrongdoing, thus preserving social bonds (Tangney, 1990; 1995). Conversely, shame is characterized by an internalisation that the entire self is “bad” (Tangney, 1990). Shame is correlated with lower empathy and can result in a predisposition for anger

and violent episodes (Tangney, 2001). For example, humiliation at being rejected, either in an initial proposal for a date or at the termination of a relationship, may produce a sense of shame that to cope with, stalkers externalize towards the victim. Whether this disposition of shame underlies some forms of stalking was the focus of the current study.

Tangney conducted further research to assess emotional traits or dispositions of shame, rather than the actual emotional state (Tangney, 1990). Observations by Lewis (1971) had previously determined that some individuals were consistently more prone to feelings of shame when faced with intensely negative or ambiguous situations. Many relationship break-ups and relationship rejections can give rise to intense negative emotions. Such situations are also often fraught with ambiguity, where one or both parties perceive that the relationship may potentially resume. Negative evaluations of the self as undesirable or inferior may give rise to feelings of shame and with it, a desire to withdraw or hide from others (Tangney, 1990; 1995). In contrast, Taylor (1985) argues that shame is derived when people consider that others see them in a negative light. Shame and guilt-proneness can effect responses in interpersonal relationships, and an externalisation of blame may be a defensive attempt to re-empower the self (Tangney, 1995). Ahmed (2001, p. 230) suggests, “feelings of shame are averted by anger and angry actions which can dominate, hurt and/or intimidate others”.

While the relationship between shame and criminal behaviour has received limited attention, it has been discussed in relation to sexual offending (e.g., Hudson, Ward & Marshall, 1992; Proeve & Howells, 2002; Roys, 1997). Roys (1997) suggests that the capacity to experience empathy may be restricted in those prone to shame. She proposed that a focus on one’s negative self-evaluations such as low self-worth and shame reduces the ability for perspective taking and experiencing the emotions of others. Similar processes may operate in relation to stalking activity, potentially arising from perceived negative evaluations by the individual who has rejected them. Shame-prone individuals may internalise rejection or

a break-up, creating a sense of shame that they are not a desirable person. Furthermore, if shame-proneness impedes the ability to recognise emotional distress in others, this may contribute to individuals continuing to pursue despite indications that the behaviour is unwanted.

While shame may not be an underlying disposition that drives all stalking, it may be one factor that initiates and maintains the unwanted behaviour of some stalkers. For example, Zona et al. (1998) describe the simple obsessional stalker as having an emotional over-investment in the relationship and may feel anger as a result of the rejection or “attack on his self image” (p. 7). This study aims to examine the extent that university students, who are often at a period in their lives when relationships are being more frequently being initiated and terminated, engage in behaviours that might be construed as stalking. As this is an exploratory study, no specific hypotheses are generated. Rather, the specific aims of the project are (1) To examine the extent of participation in intrusive behaviour in an Australian university sample; (2) To examine whether patterns of feelings such as anger and jealousy are associated with engaging in intrusive behaviour; and (3) To examine the relationship between intrusive behaviour, feelings associated with the behaviour, shame-proneness and guilt-proneness.

Method

Participants

The study comprised 222 undergraduate students enrolled in criminology at Griffith University. This sample was chosen as it is a convenient sample to conduct an exploratory study and because higher levels of stalking victimisation and perpetration have been reported in university and college samples, compared with the general population (e.g., Fisher et al., 2002). Seventy-six percent of participants were female ($n = 166$) and 24% were male ($n = 53$;

3 missing). Ages ranged from 17 – 55 years with a mean age of 25.50 ($SD = 8.63$). The majority of students (62%) reported that they were single, never having been married, while 14% were in a defacto relationship, 13% were married, and 7% were divorced or separated (4% other - boyfriend/girlfriend).

Materials

Participants completed a questionnaire comprising three sections. The first section related to the demographics of the participants. The second section examined the behaviours that participants had engaged in towards another person when pursuing a relationship or after a relationship had ceased. Participants were requested to indicate the frequency with which they had engaged in each of the 54 listed behaviours, ranging from 1 = never to 5 = frequently (more than 10 times). The list of potentially intrusive behaviours were drawn from previous research that has examined stalking victimisation (e.g., Davis, Ace & Andra, 2000; Davis & Frieze, 2000; Palarea, Zona, Lane & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1999; Pathe & Mullen, 1997; Pathe, Mullen & Purcell, 1999; Purcell, Pathe & Mullen, 2000; Sheridan, Davies & Boon, 2001a; 2001b; Sinclair & Frieze, 2000; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). This section also measured anger and jealousy responses to the rejection or break-up as this has been suggested to play a mediating role in stalking (Davis et al., 2000). These items were adapted from Davis et al. (2000). Participants were asked, “How did you feel about the break-up/rejection? Check all that are applicable”. Participants are then given a list of descriptions including “angry”, “upset at being rejected/left”, “jealous”, “couldn’t get him/her off my mind” and “thought about him/her a lot” as well as other negative, positive and neutral potential reactions.

The third section measured shame and guilt proneness using the Test for Self-Conscious Affect (TOSCA: Tangney, Wagner & Gramzow, 1989). This measure consists of 15 hypothetical situations that are likely to be encountered in normal, adult life. Following

each situations is a 5-point Likert Scale indicating how the participant would respond to the situation, ranging from 1 = not likely to 5 = very likely. Responses represented the six constructs of shame, guilt, externalization, detachment/unconcern, alpha pride and beta pride, although only shame and guilt will be the reported in this study.

Procedure

Participants completed the questionnaire in their own time and returned the document to a box provided at the University. Responses were anonymous and confidential. The survey took approximately 45 minutes to complete. The study was conducted in accordance with ethical requirements.

Results

Participation in intrusive behaviour

The data were first examined to determine the level to which participants engaged in intrusive behaviours and the contexts in which this took place. Seventy-five percent of participants indicated that they engaged in one or more of the listed behaviours at least occasionally (more than twice) following someone rejecting their advances or ending a relationship. Only 24.8% of participants indicated that they had never or rarely (once or twice) engaged in such behaviour. Forty-seven percent of participants either repeatedly (more than five times) or frequently (more than 10 times) engaged in such behaviour following rejection. The ten most common behaviours that participants engaged in at least more than five times are depicted in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 here

The most common person that the behaviours were directed towards was an ex-boyfriend or ex-husband (39%), with a current boyfriend (13%) or girlfriend (12.3%) the next

most common. Approximately 12% directed the behaviour towards an acquaintance, while 10% directed it towards an ex-girlfriend or ex-wife. Fewer participants reported engaging in the behaviours towards a casual date or estranged friend (4% respectively), and even fewer towards a work colleague (3%) or neighbour (2%). Almost half of the participants indicated that the person had ended a relationship with them (46%), while 16% reported that the person had rejected their advances (38% missing).

Of females who indicated the sex of the person they were pursuing, 97% pursued a male and 3% pursued a female (49 cases missing). Of the male respondents, 80% pursued a female and 20% pursued a male (28 cases missing). Of the five males who engaged in intrusive behaviours towards another male, three cases involved an ex-partner, one case involved a neighbour and another case involved an estranged friend.

To examine whether participants engaged in patterns of intrusive behaviour, a factor analysis was conducted to reduce the list of 54 behaviours into categories. All behaviours where less than 1% of the sample had repeatedly or frequently engaged in the behaviour were omitted from the analysis. This resulted in a factor analysis containing 30 variables. Therefore the analysis met the minimum sample size requirements of five participants per variable (Coakes & Steed, 2003). A principal components analysis was conducted and four factors were extracted, accounting for 52% of the variance. The four factors can be categorised as constituting forms of (1) Direct Communication [Cronbach's alpha = 0.86; three items deleted]; (2) Covert Pursuit [Cronbach's alpha = 0.84]; (3) Self-harm [Cronbach's alpha = 0.84]; and (4) Other-harm [Cronbach's alpha = 0.80; one item deleted]. The behaviours included within these categories are provided in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 here

To further examine these factors the scores on the items within each factor were added together and divided by the number of items in each factor, providing a range on each factor

of 1-5. There was no significant difference in the extent to which males and females engaged in Covert Pursuit, $t(212) = -1.43, p = .15$, or in the extent to which they engaged in Self-harm, $t(216) = -.98, p = .33$, or Other-harm, $t(216) = -.48, p = .63$. However, males ($M = 1.86, SD = .76$) were more likely to engage in Direct Communication than females ($M = 1.57, SD = .57$), $t(68.77) = 2.49, p = .02$.

Shame and other emotions

Females were significantly higher than males on shame-proneness, $t(204) = -2.67, p = .01$ and on guilt-proneness, $t(200) = -2.85, p = .01$. Shame and guilt scores were comparable to normative TOSCA scores based on college students in the USA, although males in the current study appeared to be slightly higher on shame-proneness than males in the normative data. See Table 3 for mean scores and comparative data.

Insert Table 3

To examine whether patterns of feelings are associated with engaging in intrusive behaviour following rejection, a factor analysis was conducted using the list of 14 feelings that participants indicated that they experienced while engaging in the various behaviours. A principal components analysis was conducted and four factors were extracted, accounting for 56% of the variance. The four factors were labelled (1) Negative Emotions [Cronbach's alpha = 0.69]; this factor included upset at being left, tense, depressed and sad]; (2) Rumination [Cronbach's alpha = 0.66; this factor included in love, not being able to get him/her off their mind, hurt, thought about him/her a lot]; (3) Anger [Cronbach's alpha = 0.61; this factor included angry, jealous, annoyed, vengeful]; and (4) Positive Emotions [Cronbach's alpha = 0.47; this factor comprised feeling excited, and happy].

Scores on anger ranged from 0 - 3 with females ($M = .56, SD = .87$) reporting a significantly higher level of Anger than males ($M = .27, SD = .60$), $t(51.11) = -2.03, p = .047$.

There were no significant differences between males and females reporting Positive Emotions, $t(140) = .29, p = .77$, Rumination $t(43.19) = -1.99, p = .053$, and Negative Emotions, $t(140) = -.98, p = .33$.

Relationship between intrusive behaviours, shame and guilt-proneness and other emotions

Given the differences between males and females on a number of measures, partial correlations controlling for gender were conducted to examine the relationship between types of intrusive behaviours, shame and guilt-proneness, and emotions while engaging in intrusive behaviour. Results are depicted in Table 4. Taking these variables together, there appears to be relationships between the type of intrusive behaviour that people engage in and the way that they feel and their proneness to experiencing shame or guilt. Engaging in Direct Communication was unrelated to either shame-proneness or guilt-proneness. Engaging in Covert Pursuit was also unrelated to shame or guilt but was positively related to Rumination. Engaging in acts of Self-harm or threatened self-harm were positively associated with guilt-proneness and Negative Emotions, while engaging in Other-harm was related to Anger and Negative Emotions, but not shame or guilt-proneness. Despite shame being unrelated to the various forms of intrusive behaviour, it was positively correlated with Rumination while engaging in the behaviours.

Insert Table 4 here

Discussion

This study represented a preliminary examination of the relationship between intrusive behaviour, shame-proneness and other emotions. In examining the extent of participation in intrusive behaviour it appears that university students engage in a wide range of potentially intrusive behaviours following rejection of attempts to initiate a relationship or after the

dissolution of a relationship, with some individuals engaging in these actions quite frequently. As many of these behaviours are also central to the courting or relationship reconciliation process, it is important that this study and other similar studies do not necessarily construe them as negative actions. The behaviours covered a broad spectrum, from the relatively innocuous to physically harmful. The findings are consistent with those of Sinclair and Frieze (2000) who found that the majority of men and women in their college sample engaged in intrusive behaviours that could constitute stalking.

The behaviours that participants engaged in could be divided into four broad categories comprising forms of Direct Communication, Covert Pursuit where the individual made no attempts to communicate directly with the object of their affections, Self-harm and Other-harm. Few of the participants in this study engaged in the more destructive forms of pursuit behaviour such as Self-harm and Other-harm. Males were significantly more likely to engage in Direct Communication compared to females, but there was no significant difference between males and females for Covert Pursuit. Therefore this study contrasts slightly to the findings of Sinclair and Frieze (2000) and Haugaard and Seri (2004) that both men and women engage in similar levels of intrusive behaviour, as it appears that males in the present study are more likely to make direct approaches to communicate with the person that has rejected them than are females.

In examining whether patterns of feelings were associated with intrusive behaviour, the study found that the emotions could be divided into four categories comprising Positive Emotions, Negative Emotions, Anger (including jealousy) and Rumination. Females reported higher levels of Anger than males, as well as higher levels of shame-proneness. When examining the relationship between the behaviour, feelings and shame and guilt-proneness, one of the main findings was that engaging in Covert Pursuit was related to Rumination. Engaging in Self-harm was related to guilt-proneness and Negative Emotions, such as feeling

upset at being left and feeling tense, depressed and sad. While those who engaged in harm towards others also reported Negative Emotions, they also reported feelings of Anger, including feeling jealous, annoyed and vengeful.

Given the literature relating shame-proneness to anger experiences (e.g., Ahmed, 2001; Tangney, 2001), it was somewhat surprising that shame was unrelated to engaging in harm to others. However, in this sample few participants had engaged in aggressive and physically harmful behaviour, therefore a larger sample size of more serious examples of stalking may be beneficial for future research.

Shame-proneness was related to experiencing ruminating feelings while engaging in unwanted behaviours. One explanation for this finding, utilising a theory of shame approach, is that shame-prone individuals may internalise rejection or a break-up, creating a sense of shame and low-self worth. This may lead to rumination over the situation, which included feeling hurt, feeling in love, not being able to get the person off their mind and thinking about the person a lot. As engaging in Covert Pursuit was positively associated with Rumination, it is possible that engaging in behaviours such as following, watching and other forms of reconnaissance was triggered by the rumination, although it may also serve to reinforce the obsessive feelings. For example, the continuation of stalking is thought to be determined by the consequences of the stalking (Westrup, 2000). Perhaps engaging in this surreptitious form of pursuit puts the individual at a lesser risk of experiencing further shame, as opposed to engaging in more direct forms of communication where further rejection is probable. However, shame and Covert Pursuit were not significantly correlated, although there was a weak association between these two constructs. As this study was correlational, no causal conclusions can be drawn. Therefore future research should examine whether engaging in covert stalking behaviours is in fact triggered by ruminating and how this behaviour may be reinforced over time.

A number of limitations are present in this study, including the small sample of males and the use of a university sample, which limits the generalisability of results. Despite these limitations, this study has provided some evidence for a relationship between shame-proneness and feelings of Rumination while engaging in unwanted pursuit behaviour. The next step should be to explore these relationships in a community sample and more importantly, with a sample of convicted stalkers. Should relationships between unwanted and persistent intrusive behaviour, rumination and shame be found in a stalker population, this may provide valuable information for the management and treatment of stalkers. In fact, Mullen et al. (2000) suggest that treatment of stalkers should consider behaviour change, at least in part, in relation to the negative impact on the self and perhaps importantly, move the stalker to a point where they can cease stalking without losing face. Future research should also examine the negative emotions that may drive self-harm and the role of anger and jealousy in harm to others. Furthermore, Mullen et al. (2000) suggest that the persistent and intrusive behaviour of the rejected stalker may be associated with narcissism as well as jealousy and anger. A better understanding of the relationship between negative emotions, personality traits or disorders and behaviours may contribute to typology research and prove important in developing interventions with stalkers, as well as in assessing important features of stalking, such as risk of violence.

The present study examined the intrusive behaviour of university students who faced rejection either through the termination of a relationship or a refusal to form a relationship. The study also examined whether emotions such as shame, anger and jealousy were present in those who engaged in repeated intrusive behaviour. Importantly, the study found that engaging in Covert Pursuit was associated Rumination and that Rumination was positively associated with shame-proneness, while Self-harm was associated with Negative Emotions and Other-harm was associated with Negative Emotions as well as feelings of Anger and

jealousy. These findings offer some insight into the emotions that may drive different types of intrusive behaviours and stalking, however these relationships have previously remained unexplored and require replication and extension. Theoretical research and explanations of stalking and intrusive behaviour are required to further advance goals of prevention and intervention with stalkers.

References

- Ahmed, E. (2001). The concept of shame management. In E. Ahmed, N. Harris, J. Braithwaite and V. Braithwaite (Eds.), *Shame management through reintegration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Budd, T., & Mattinson, J. (2000). *The extent and nature of stalking: Findings from the 1998 British Crime Survey*. Home Office Research Study N. 210. London: Home Office.
- Coakes, S. J. & Steed, L. G. (2003). *SPSS analysis without anguish: Version 11.0 for Windows*. Milton, QLD: John Wiley and Sons.
- Davis, K. E., Ace, A., & Andra, M. (2000). Stalking perpetrators and psychological maltreatment of partners: Anger-jealousy, attachment insecurity, need for control, and break-up context. *Violence and Victims, 15* (4), 407 – 425.
- Davis, K. E. & Frieze, I. H. (2000). Research on stalking: What do we know and where do we go? *Violence and Victims, 15* (4), 473 – 487.
- Dennison, S. M., & Thomson, D. M. (2002). Identifying stalking: The relevance of intent in commonsense reasoning. *Law and Human Behavior, 26* (5), 543-561.
- Emerson, R. M., Ferris, K. O., & Gardner, C. B. (1998). On Being Stalked, *Social Problems, 45* (3), 289-314.
- Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2002). Being pursued: Stalking victimization in a national study of college women. *Criminology and Public Policy, 1* (2), 257 – 308.
- Haugaard, J. & Seri, L. (2004). Stalking and other forms of intrusive contact among adolescents and young adults from the perspective of the person initiating the intrusive contact. *Criminal Justice and Behavior 31* (1), 37-54.
- Hills, A. M. & Taplin, J. L. (1998). Anticipated responses to stalking: Effect of threat and target-stalker relationship. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law, 5* (1), 139 – 146.

- Hudson, S. M., Ward, T., & Marshall, W. L. (1992). The abstinence violation effect in sex offenders: A reformulation. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, *30*, 435-441.
- Lewis, H. B. (1971). *Shame and guilt in neurosis*. New York: International University Press.
- Mullen, P. E., Pathe, M., & Purcell, R. (2000). *Stalkers and their victims*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Palarea, R. E., Zona, M. A., Lane, J. C., & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (1999). The dangerous nature of intimate relationship stalking: Threats, violence, and associated risk factors. *Behavioural Sciences and the Law*, *17*, 269 – 283.
- Pathe, M. & Mullen, P. E. (1997). The impact of stalkers on their victims. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, *170*, 12 – 17.
- Pathe, M., Mullen, P.E., & Purcell, R. (1999). Stalking: false claims of victimization. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, *174*, 170 – 172.
- Proeve, M. & Howells, K. (2002). Shame and guilt in child sexual offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *46* (6), 657-667.
- Purcell, R., Pathe, M., & Mullen, P. E. (2000). The incidence and nature of stalking victimisation. *Paper presented at the Stalking: Criminal Justice Responses Conference convened by the Australian Institute of Criminology, Sydney, 7 – 8 December.*
- Roys, D. T. (1997). Empirical and theoretical considerations of empathy in sex offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *41*, 53-64.
- Sheridan, L., Davies, G. M., & Boon, J. C. W. (2001a). Stalking: Perceptions and prevalence, *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *16*, 151-167.
- Sheridan, L., Davies, G. M., & Boon, J. (2001b). The course and nature of stalking: A victim perspective, *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, *40* (3), 215-234.

- Sinclair, H. C. & Frieze, I. H. (2000). Initial courtship behavior and stalking: How should we draw the line? *Violence and Victims*, 15 (1), 23 – 40.
- Taylor, G. (1985). *Pride, shame, and guilt: Emotions of self-assessment*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon.
- Tangney, J. (1990). Assessing individual differences in proneness to shame and guilt: Development of the self-conscious affect and attribution inventory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59 (1), 102 – 111.
- Tangney, J. (1995). Shame and guilt in interpersonal relationships. In J. P. Tangney, & K. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment and pride*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Tangney, J. P. (2001). Constructive and destructive aspects of shame and guilt. In A. C. Bohart, & D. J. Stipek (Eds.), *Constructive and destructive behavior: Implications for family, school and society*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Tangney, J., Wagner, P., & Gramzow, R. (1989). *The Test of Self-Conscious Affect (TOSCA)*. Fairfax, VA: George Mason University.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1998). *Stalking in America: Findings from the national violence against women survey*. Washington, DC: National Institute for Justice and the Center for Policy Research report.
- Tjaden, P., Thoennes, N., & Allison, C. J. (2000). Comparing stalking victimisation from legal and victim perspectives. *Violence and Victims*, 15 (1), 7-22.
- Westrup, D. (2000). Stalking in the US: Time to focus on treatment. *Paper presented at the Stalking: Criminal Justice Responses Conference convened by the Australian Institute of Criminology, Sydney, 7 – 8 December*.

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

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

Table 1.

Behaviours engaged in more than 5 times	N	%
Asked friends about person	55	24.8
Tried to show up at social or recreational events where you know person will be	30	13.5
Found out information about person by means other than asking person for it	26	11.7
Asked person out as friends	25	11.3
Sent or gave person notes, letters or other written communications (except emails)	23	10.4
Sent person emails	25	11.3
Drove, rode or walked purposefully past the person's residence, work or school	20	9.0
Verbally abused person	23	10.4
Made direct approaches to converse with the person	17	7.7
Did unrequested favours for him/her	18	8.1

Note. $N = 176$

Table 2

Categories of Intrusive Behaviour from Factor Analysis

Factor	Loading	Eigenvalue
Direct Communication		8.14
Written communication (other than emails)	.63	
Sent person emails	.57	
Asked person out as friends	.74	
Did unrequested favours for him/her	.75	
Asked person out on a date	.66	
Sent or gave person gifts	.71	
Made direct approaches to converse with person	.49	
Offered to buy person a drink	.62	
Made arrangements on person's behalf without first consulting them	.59	
Agreed with every word of the person, even when they were wrong	.52	
Covert Pursuit		2.84
Tried to show up at social events where you knew the person would be	.53	
Found out information about person by means other than asking person for it	.64	
Drove, rode or walked purposefully past the person's residence, work or school	.65	
Waited or stood outside person's class, school, home or work	.69	
Followed person	.66	
Changed classes, offices or otherwise took up an activity to be closer to person	.45	
Spied on person	.75	
Made hang-up phone calls	.61	
Took photographs of person without their knowledge	.67	
Intercepted person's mail	.46	
Spread false rumours about the person	.51	
Asked friends about person	.43	
Self-harm		2.45
Attempted to hurt yourself	.87	
Physically hurt yourself	.87	
Threatened to hurt yourself	.78	
Other-harm		2.05
Threatened to hurt person emotionally	.69	
Attempted to verbally abuse person	.84	
Verbally abused person	.84	
Made unwanted telephone calls (spoke to person)	.45	
Left messages on telephone	.47	

Table 3

Mean shame and guilt scores and comparison TOSCA norms for college students.

Gender	Current Study		Normative Data (4 studies) ^a	
	Shame	Guilt	Shame	Guilt
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Males	42.88 (8.24)	56.32 (6.64)	39.25-40.65 (6.74-8.72)	55.00-56.97 (6.13-6.76)
Females	46.63 (8.75)	59.20 (6.80)	42.04-46.16 (7.67-8.68)	59.10-60.39 (5.24-6.53)

Note. ^a Taken from Tangney et al., (1989).

Table 4

Correlations between types of intrusive behaviour, shame and guilt, and feelings associated with behaviour

	Covert	Direct	Self-harm	Other-harm	Shame	Guilt	Rumination	Negative	Positive	Anger
Covert	1.00									
Direct	.419**	1.00								
Self-harm	.119	.257*	1.00							
Other-harm	.221	.441**	.378**	1.00						
Shame	.211	.070	.156	-.008	1.00					
Guilt	.153	.066	.262*	.069	.578**	1.00				
Rumination	.278*	.183	.165	.171	.283*	.217	1.00			
Negative	.157	.111	.240*	.287*	.123	.146	.466**	1.00		
Positive	-.013	.124	-.022	-.122	-.036	-.164	-.168	-.255*	1.00	
Anger	.188	.069	.194	.569**	.085	.079	.138	.363**	-.180	1.00

Note. * $p < .01$ ** $p < .001$; $df = 123$.

Susan M. Dennison* PhD

Lecturer

School of Criminology and Criminal Justice

Griffith University

Mt Gravatt Campus

QLD 4111 Australia

Email: Susan.Dennison@griffith.edu.au

Anna Stewart PhD

Senior Lecturer

School of Criminology and Criminal Justice

Griffith University

Mt Gravatt Campus

QLD 4111 Australia

Email: A.Stewart@griffith.edu.au

* To whom correspondence should be addressed.