

THE INFLUENCE OF GENDER IDENTITY AND SEX ON PERCEPTIONS OF
RELATIONAL STALKING

by

Ellen Ratajack

March, 2011

Director of Thesis: Dr. Amy Lyndon

Major Department: Research Psychology

The purpose of this study was to examine how participant and target gender identity may alter perceptions of relational stalking. Gender roles and schemas may help to shape perceptions of stalking and thus change how people will judge a situation as stalking. In addition to examining judgments of stalking, this study examined the endorsement of stalking myths and how such endorsements become engrained and supported. A pilot study was conducted to test the portrayal of target gender identity in hypothetical relationship scenarios. The current study examined how participants rated a hypothetical scenario to be stalking based on target gender, participant gender and scenario severity. Scenario severity was the only significant predictor for how participants judged a scenario as stalking or non-stalking. Additional analyses indicated that men endorsed more stalking myths than women. The results of this study suggest that more research is necessary to investigate the intricacies of how sex and gender identity may alter judgments of stalking, regardless of severity.

THE INFLUENCE OF GENDER IDENTITY AND SEX ON PERCEPTIONS OF
RELATIONAL STALKING

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of Psychology

East Carolina University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Psychology

by

Ellen M. Ratajack

March, 2011

©Copyright 2011

ELLEN RATAJACK

THE INFLUENCE OF GENDER IDENTITY AND SEX
ON PERCEPTIONS OF RELATIONAL STALKING

by

Ellen M. Ratajack

APPROVED BY:

DIRECTOR OF THESIS

Amy Lyndon, Ph.D.

COMMITTEE MEMBER

Karl L. Wuensch, Ph.D.

COMMITTEE MEMBER

Derrick Wirtz, Ph.D.

CHAIR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Kathleen A. Row, Ph.D.

DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

Paul J. Gemperline, Ph.D.

Acknowledgements

I would like to offer my sincere thanks to Dr. Amy Lyndon, who directed this thesis, as well as to Dr. Karl Wuensch and Dr. Derrick Wirtz for the exceptional time, aid, and insight that they each contributed to this project. I would also like to thank my family for their unyielding support throughout this process.

Table of Contents

List of Tables.....	<i>ix</i>
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Gender and perceptions of stalking.....	3
Gender Schema Theory and Gender Roles.....	6
Courtship, Maintenance and Termination of Romantic Relationships According to Gender.....	9
CHAPTER II: PILOT TEST OF SCENARIOS.....	14
Method	14
Participants.....	14
Procedure.....	14
Materials.....	14
Results and Discussion	15
CHAPTER III: GENDER IDENTITY ON JUDGMENTS OF STALKING ...	19
Method	19
Participants.....	19
Design	20
Procedure.....	20

Materials.....	21
Results	24
CHAPTER IV: GENERAL DISCUSSION	27
REFERENCES	32
APPENDIX A: IRB DOCUMENTATION	38
APPENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT STUDY I	40
APPENDIX C: TRADITIONAL GENDER ROLES NON-STALKING SCENARIO	44
APPENDIX D: TRADITIONAL GENDER ROLES STALKING SCENARIO	47
APPENDIX E: REVERSE GENDER ROLES NON-STALKING SCENARIO	50
APPENDIX F: REVERSE GENDER ROLES STALKING SCENARIO	53
APPENDIX G: DEBRIEFING FORM STUDY I.....	56
APPENDIX H: INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT STUDY II	57
APPENDIX I: EXTENDED PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES QUESTIONNAIRE	61
APPENDIX J: STALKING MYTH SCALE.....	63

APPENDIX K: JUDGMENTS OF STALKING QUESTIONS.....	65
APPENDIX L: DEBRIEFING FORM STUDY II.....	71
APPENDIX M: SMS PERMISSION LETTER.....	73

LIST OF TABLES

1. Pilot Study Multiple Comparisons of Agency and Communion within the Scenarios..... 17
2. Regressions with Target Gender, Participant Gender and Severity to Predict Judgments of Stalking..... 25

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Themes of unrequited love, desire to repair broken relationships, and expectations on how to fix what was lost after the termination of a romantic relationship permeate society. Seemingly romantic notions can have a darker element and may involve stalking. Stalking is still considered a relatively new concept that has only been regarded as a crime for approximately twenty years (Sheridan, Gillett, Davies, Blaauw & Patel, 2003). Stalking is defined as a repeated course of conduct with implicit or explicit threats that would cause a reasonable person fear (National Center for Victims of Crime, 2007; National Criminal Justice Association, 1993). While this is the most common definition of stalking in the United States of America, there is still a great deal of ambiguity. This ambiguity is a result of lack of agreement in regards to several different aspects of stalking. For example, there are discrepancies regarding the seriousness of the incident, the type of relationship between the perpetrator and victim, and other issues regarding intent and the requirement of fear (DOJ/OJP, 2001).

Judgments of stalking can vary based on the specific situation, sex of the victim and perpetrator, and preconceived opinions about stalking in general. Such preconceived opinions may be a result of schemas within society, specifically assigned gender roles, and thus the gender identity of those involved and those observing the stalking situation. Gender identity may influence how people perceive stalking situations especially if that stalking occurs within or after the context of a romantic relationship.

The purpose of the present study was to examine how gender identity influences perceptions of stalking situations following the termination of an intimate relationship

from the participant gender identity and target gender roles. Even though gender and sex are often used interchangeably, gender refers to gender identity and not biological sex (American Psychological Association, 2010; Diamond, 2000). Gender is a socially and culturally derived mechanism, whereas sex is biological. Previous researchers have examined how sex, but not gender, may have influenced perceptions of stalking (Dennison & Thomson, 2002; Phillips, Quirk, Rosenfeld & O'Connor, 2004; Sheridan, Gillet, Davies, Blaauw, & Patel, 2003; Sheridan & Scott, 2010; Yanowitz, 2006). These studies have found mixed results about how sex may or may not be influential to perceptions of stalking. Rather than simply examining sex differences, it is important to also examine gender identity, because gender is a result of exposure to expectations within the given culture (Bem, 1981). This study also examined how the severity of pursuit behaviors and traditionally gendered ideas regarding stalking myths influence perceptions of stalking situations.

Men are more likely to be perpetrators of stalking than women and women tend to be the victims of stalking (Spitzberg & Cupach, 2007). Stalking most often occurs following the termination of a romantic relationship (Spitzberg & Cupach, 2007; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). While it is true that both men and women can be and are stalked by former partners, women are more likely than men to be victims of relational stalking (Baum, Catalano, Rand, & Rose, 2009; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998; Yanowitz, 2006). This sex difference may be a result of gender roles that often say that men need to have power and control of a relationship. This concept is particularly salient in patriarchal societies. If a man loses his power because a woman ends a relationship with him, he must do anything necessary in order to regain his power, even if that means he must

stalk his former partner (Brewster, 2003). Gender schema theory suggests that this trend may be due to gender roles that have been assigned by society (Bem, 1981). People are not born with a pre-determined gender identity; rather gender identity develops over time. It is also possible that gendered relationship scripts contribute to beliefs about stalking. Scripts have been established for the beginning, middle and end of romantic relationships and these scripts are based on traditional gender roles (Battaglia, Richard, Datteri, & Lord, 1998; Choo, Levine, Hatfield, 1996). It is possible that perceptions of stalking may be a result of exaggerated societal gender roles and the acceptance of stalking myths.

Believing certain myths or ideals about stalking may determine how people perceive stalking and the acceptability of stalking based on gender roles and relationship scripts. Stalking myths developed in a similar fashion as rape myths. Rape myths are misconceptions about rape that often place more blame on the victim and thus, the perpetrator is not held accountable for rape (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994). This belief often determines what outside observers believe to be “real rape.” Men are more likely to endorse rape myths than women (Suarez & Gadalla, 2010). Believing rape myths typically means that rape in the context of intimate relationships often goes overlooked or is not considered “real rape” (Sinclair, 2006). If the same trend applies to stalking, then perpetrators will be assigned with less blame than their victims for their actions. Stalking in the context of an intimate relationship is likely to be disregarded. The just world theory supports stalking myth ideas as well (Sheridan et al., 2003).

Gender and perceptions of stalking

Men and women do not necessarily perceive stalking situations in the same way. Past research has demonstrated how biological sex and personal experience with stalking can influence people's judgments about potential stalking situations. Several researchers have found differences in perceptions of stalking scenarios based on participant and target sex (Dennison & Thomson, 2002; Hills & Taplin, 1998; Phillips et al., 2004; Sheridan & Scott, 2010) while others have found that participant and target sex does not make a difference (Sheridan, Gillett & Davies, 2002; Sheridan et al., 2003). Much of the information gathered about sex influencing perceptions of stalking scenarios was gathered through scenario-based research that manipulated the sex of the characters in the vignettes. Biological sex can be a determining factor as to whether or not a situation would be more or less likely to depict stalking. Specifically, when the perpetrator is male more concern for a female victim's safety is expressed. Participant sex also significantly affected responses; women were more likely to perceive a situation as stalking than men, regardless of the target's sex (Dennison & Thomson, 2002; Hills & Taplin, 1998; Phillips et al, 2004).

Dennison and Thomson (2002) presented participants with scenarios that manipulated intent on the part of the stalker, persistence, amount of fear on the part of the victim, and relationship to the stalker. After reading the given scenarios, women, more than men, perceived the situations as stalking and believed that the stalker intended to cause harm and fear. Hills & Taplin (1998) also found that women, more so than men, reported that they would be more likely to call for police intervention and feel afraid in a stalking situation.

Sheridan and Scott (2010) also found that sex of the perpetrator and potential harm to the victim are influential factors for the perception of stalking cases. Female perpetrators were again perceived as less dangerous than male perpetrators. Male perpetrators were considered to be more criminal than female perpetrators. However, with regards to female and male victims of physical violence, male victims were assigned more responsibility for their own victimization. Also, when threats and abuse are present the victim had less responsibility for the stalking.

Perceptions of stalking have not always been significantly related to participant sex, which could suggest that men and women agree on what constitutes as stalking behaviors (Sheridan et al., 2002). Sheridan et al. (2003) also found that sex of the targets in the scenarios did not affect participants' judgments of severity of stalking. Men are expected to take care of themselves according to gender schemas and thus, it might lead one to conclude that stalking situations with a female perpetrator and a male victim would be rated as less serious.

In addition to observing differences in perceptions of stalking based on participant sex and manipulating the target sex in the scenarios, other interesting trends were revealed in the scenario-based studies. Men who had personal knowledge about stalking were more likely to rate less severe stalking behaviors as stalking than men who had no experience with stalking (Yanowitz, 2006). Women were more likely to rate a situation as stalking and felt that more fear would be elicited from the victim of a stalking situation than did men (Dennison & Thomson, 2002).

Perceived stalking severity may also predict participants' judgments of stalking. Any type of invasive behaviors are viewed as annoying, but women more so than men,

find intrusive behaviors to go beyond annoying (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2000). When certain behaviors are viewed as annoying, people are less likely to perceive the situation as stalking. However, behaviors, such as sending threatening messages and directly invading one's privacy, are seen as more severe stalking behaviors, which constitute a situation as stalking.

These studies suggest that men and women may perceive stalking situations differently, but this trend is not consistent. Societal constructs provide specific ideas of how men and women are expected to act in accordance with their biological sex. Gender roles determine what behaviors are appropriate based on biological sex (Bem, 1981). While sex of the characters in a scenario may guide the way in which participants will perceive a situation, target sex does not provide detailed accounts of a victim's or perpetrator's purpose for carrying out certain behaviors in conjunction with stereotypical behaviors. Some stalking behaviors may be viewed differently (more or less acceptable) based on the gender identities of both the participants and the victims and perpetrators. Gender roles deem what behaviors are acceptable according to biological sex and many gender roles are influenced by schemas. People are likely to rely on past schemas or ideas that they have about a situation in order to make judgments about that particular situation.

Gender Schema Theory and Gender Roles

It is not uncommon for people to confuse or ignore the difference between the meanings of gender and sex. Sex is biological and pre-determines what physical attributes a person will possess; gender identity begins to develop at an early age, but is not pre-determined. Gender identity is formed by certain exposure and experiences

that people have within the given culture. Gender identity is also shaped by other factors, such as parental expectations. According to theorists like Bem (1981), gender ideology begins during childhood. At a young age, children take note as to what is appropriate for their sex and how they are expected to act in accordance to their biological sex. Gender schema theory offers an explanation as to how gender forms in relation to societal expectations.

A schema is a cognitive structure, a picture or concept of common ideas that creates and determines people's perceptions, as well as functioning as a predictive structure. Schemas organize stored information from past experiences to help people determine what to expect of future situations; they are concepts of common ideas that will work to guide people's perceptions of the world around them (Bem, 1981; Markus, 1977). People will often rely on schemas when presented with a new situation, person, or experience and so that they can form judgments based on prior schemas (Carli, 1999; Higgins, Rholes & Jones, 1977; Zadny & Gerard, 1974). Schemas influence what people notice, interpret, and remember. Schematic processing is very selective, which allows people to create structure and specific ideas or conclusions when presented with novel stimuli (Bem, 1981). Schemas form at a young age and children often have ideas about how others are supposed to act based on sex (Tobin et al., 2010). Not only do children attribute gender schemas to others, but these concepts often become internalized as well.

Gender schema theory may be beneficial when attempting to describe certain behaviors or beliefs for determining gendered behaviors. Gender schema theory proposes that sex typing, the basis for treating people based on biological sex, is due in

part to gender-based schematic processing. This means that people will rely on preconceptions about how others should act according to society's standards for each sex. Established schemas for gender greatly determine how people will sex-type others. Sex-typed individuals, people who describe themselves in accordance with societal norms or expectations, are more likely to rely on gender-schematic processing more than non sex-typed people (Bem, 1981).

Gender-schema theory may provide important insight when examining perceptions of stalking. Sex-typed people may believe that certain stalking-like actions are acceptable based on the sex of the victim or perpetrator and thus, the appropriate gender roles assigned to each sex. Gender roles have been defined as shared beliefs, which are often stereotypical, that are commonly applicable to all people based on determined sex (Eagley, 1987). Gender roles are the basis for developing beliefs about what is appropriate for each sex. The two most common gender role labels are communal and agentic (Eagley, 2009). According to Western cultures, communal implies connectivity to others and agentic implies self-assertion and independence. Typically, communal gender roles are attributed to women and agentic gender roles are attributed to men. These gender roles that have been assigned to men and women dictate what behaviors have been deemed appropriate by society in accordance with an individual's biological sex. Men are expected to be powerful, independent, and domineering, women are socialized to act emotional, dependent and gentle. If these gender roles are upheld, stereotypic behaviors will categorize men as dominant and competitive and women as cooperative and submissive (Kluwer, de Dreu, & Buunk, 1998). For example, women have been taught through the internalization of gender

roles that they should be fearful of certain situations, contexts or individuals, such as being alone at night (Dietz & Martin, 2007). Feeling vulnerable to violence is one stereotypical aspect of being feminine. In general, gender roles emphasize that women should be reliant on men, thoughtful of others, caring, and dependent; men should have control and power, in addition to being self-reliant and assertive.

Gender roles may help determine what behaviors are deemed as acceptable or characteristic of relationships based on the sex of those involved in the relationship. However, women can be agentic in nature and men can be communal. In regards to stalking victimization, it may be possible that communal people are viewed as more like victims than agentic people; not simply women are victims and men are not. While women and men as victims of stalking has been studied, communal people and agentic people as potential victims have not.

Courtship, Maintenance and Termination of Romantic Relationships According to Gender

Gender roles are also applicable to common relationship scripts. Courtship, maintenance, and termination of a romantic relationship follow scripts for how a relationship is expected to be carried out. Gender roles influence people's behaviors based on sex and what gender they identify with and infiltrate most aspects of people's lives and behaviors. One realm where gender roles are observable is in intimate relationships. The way people act before, during, and after relationships are often influenced by gender roles and relationship scripts (Battaglia et al, 1998; Holmberg & MacKenzie, 2002). Certain behaviors in the relationship process are deemed more acceptable or even expected based on sex and thus, the accompanying gender role

that is attributed to each individual's sex. Traditional ideas of courtship behaviors include the following: men pursue women and are responsible for providing the intended woman with gifts and attention; women graciously accept gifts and attention and are flattered by such actions (Rudman & Glick, 2008). In general, men are expected to initiate romantic relationships and women are expected to accept romantic advances so that a relationship may be established. For instance, men tend to place more sexual meaning on other's behaviors than do women (Jacques-Tiura, Abbey, Parkhill & Zawacki, 2007; Kowalski, 1993). This may lead to misinterpreted cues or expectations; problems may arise in the relationship if one person interprets signals as sexual but the signals are neutral or casual.

Society determines what behaviors are appropriate, but these behaviors may not be acceptable under all circumstances. If the target of romantic advances does not desire a relationship with the pursuer, typical courtship behaviors can become annoying or even threatening (Sinclair & Frieze, 2005). For example, sending flowers is seen as an acceptable courtship behavior, however, in a different context this behavior could be seen as a stalking behavior. This determination of stalking or not is at least partially based on the activation of gendered romantic scripts (Dunn, 1999; Emerson, Gardner, & Ferris, 1998). Cultural beliefs about a woman's "no" meaning "try harder" may only influence pursuers to contact romantic interests even more. Negative signals or complete rejection go unnoticed or ignored and are sometimes completely misinterpreted as positive interest (Sinclair & Frieze, 2005). However, women may feel like they need to provide emotional support for men even when rejecting them in the

relationship. Gender roles can be activated during each phase of relationships, including the courtship phase.

Power, self-reliance and control are typically seen as masculine characteristics and thus men will be powerful and dominant in relationships while women are expected to be emotional, submissive and dependent (Rudman & Glick, 2008). Men may pursue women out of desire for love and emotional gain or out of a desire for power and control (White, Kowalski, Lyndon, & Valentine, 2000). Either way, male pursuit is normative according to typical romantic scripts and some courting behaviors may even be seen as polite or chivalrous. Once the relationship has been established it is also expected that men will have control within the relationship according to romantic scripts.

There are also scripts for ending a romantic relationship. Eventually the benefits of ending the relationship outweigh the benefits of remaining in the relationship and the intimate relationship is terminated by one or both partners (Battaglia et al, 1998). Once a relationship has ended, it is not uncommon for partners to engage in stalking behaviors (Davis, Ace, & Andra, 2000; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Palarea, Cohen, & Rohling, 2000). These behaviors may be typical for people who have normal relationships, but the situation may change drastically for partners involved in unhealthy relationships. People who stalk former partners often do so in order to regain the control that they possessed during the relationship.

Mild aggression during the courtship phase of a relationship and violence that occurs during the actual relationship is an ominous sign that stalking behaviors are likely to occur once the intimate relationship has ended (Williams & Frieze, 2005). Men are more likely than women to use methods of intimidation in order to begin or sustain a

relationship and power and control are strong motivators for aggressive behaviors. Stalking is often used as a way to regain power after one partner has ended the relationship; the partner who originally had control of power in the relationship uses stalking as a way to regain power (Brewster, 2003). This may occur more often in the context of unhealthy relationships.

Not only are men expected to regain control of a relationship, sometimes through stalking behaviors, but some theories seem to promote the idea that men are actually entitled to stalk former partners and thus, perpetuate stalking myths. The just world theory, explains that people want to believe that the world is a fair and just place where people get what they deserve; this theory promotes the justification of stalking following the end of a relationship (Rubin & Peplau, 1975). The just-world theory suggests that stalking victims somehow deserve to be stalked based on their past actions. The right to stalk someone also depends on the relationship between the two individuals (Sheridan et al., 2003). For example, a man may be more entitled to stalk a former partner because he has to regain control of the relationship. A man who stalks a woman he was not romantically attached to does not have the right to stalk her because they may not have a strong history together, if any history at all. This theory supports additional stalking myths as well. These myths include ideas like “stalking isn’t violence unless the stalker has tried to physically harm the victim,” “stalking only takes place when the other person is a stranger” and “being in love is an acceptable excuse to stalk someone,” (Sinclair, 2006). Not only is the blame for stalking behaviors redirected at the victim, but perpetrators actually believe that it is their right to stalk their partners and thus, should not be blamed for any stalking behaviors.

Stalking myths are also perpetuated once gender roles, especially traditional gender roles, are activated. The just world theory supports motivation for stalking behaviors if they are justifiable. Such motivators for stalking behaviors could be regaining power, showing romantic intentions, and reestablishing a relationship with a former partner. Because society views certain stalking behaviors such as sending letters, calling someone and sending presents in a positive light - depending on the context - stalking myths are commonly held. Stalking myths combined with gender roles perpetuate the acceptability of agentic men stalking communal women.

Based on the above research, I have several hypotheses about how people will perceive hypothetical stalking situations. The first hypothesis is that a potential stalking victim with a communal gender identity will be judged as more likely to be stalked, needing intervention, (etc.) than agentic potential stalking victims. Because women are more likely to be the victims of stalking, the victim in each scenario will always be female with a male perpetrator. The second hypothesis is that severe pursuit will be more likely to be judged as stalking and in need of intervention (etc.) than less severe pursuit. The third hypothesis is that participants with a communal gender identity will judge the situation as stalking more so than participants with an agentic gender identity. Finally, the fourth hypothesis is that men and women will have differential endorsements of stalking myths.

CHAPTER II: PILOT TEST OF SCENARIOS

The purpose of the pilot study was to determine the reliability and validity of the four hypothetical scenarios that were created for the main study. The four scenarios depicted a romantic relationship between a heterosexual couple from the beginning to the end of the relationship.

Method

Participants. Participants were recruited using the on-line participant management system at a large public university and were offered course credit in return for participating ($N = 125$).

Procedure. Participants were directed to the survey web site and prompted to read an informed consent document and acknowledge that they have read the form and agreed to participate. After providing consent, participants read one of four scenarios. After reading the scenario, participants were prompted to answer questions about each character of the scenario to determine the type of gender role each character portrayed. Once participants completed the questionnaire they were directed to a debriefing page and received credit for their participation.

Materials. The Extended Version of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (EPAQ: Spence, Helmreich, & Holahan, 1979) was used to create the gender identity of the characters in each scenario. The EPAQ is a continuous measure which offers a greater range of diversity for responses. The EPAQ has three different subscales, agency, communion, and unmitigated agency with Cronbach alphas of .85, .82 and .78, respectively. The EPAQ contains 24 bipolar adjective items, such as “not at all arrogant” to “very arrogant” and “not at all kind” to “very kind.” The range of scores

possible for each question is from 1 to 5 and higher scores indicate a greater relation to the given gender characteristic (agentic or communal qualities).

Four different scenarios were created. Participants only read one scenario and answered questions about the characters of that scenario. Each scenario depicted the formation, maintenance, and dissolution of a romantic relationship that occurred between a heterosexual couple. The male target always pursued the female target once the relationship ended. Two of the scenarios depicted a stalking situation and two scenarios depicted a non-stalking situation. For each stalking or non-stalking scenario, there were two different depictions of the targets' gender roles. In one story, traditional gender roles were depicted. That is, the male character was agentic in nature and the female character was communal in nature. In the other story, reverse gender roles were depicted. In the reverse gender role story, the male character was communal in nature and the female character portrayed an agentic gender role.

Results and Discussion

In order to determine how well the scenarios portrayed gender identity for each character, a MANOVA was conducted to test for differences between agency and communion of the characters within the four different scenarios. The scenario read by participants had significant influence on gender ratings of the characters, Wilks' $\Lambda = .003$, $F(6, 116) = 5843.81$, $p < .001$. That is, each character correctly reflected the gender role that was being portrayed in each scenario. The female character "Ashley" was viewed as more communal than agentic in the traditional gender role scenario and the male character "Shawn" was more agentic than communal in the traditional gender role scenario. For the reverse gender scenarios, Ashley was depicted as more agentic

than communal and Shawn was more communal than agentic. Univariate analyses indicate the following influence of target gender in each scenario: Total agency for Ashley $F(3, 121) = 4.15, p = .008$, for total communion for Ashley $F(3, 121) = 22.68, p < .001$, for total agency for Shawn $F(3, 121) = 10.36, p < .001$, and for total communion for Shawn $F(3, 121) = 20.10, p < .001$. Table 1 provides the means and standard deviations for each character in the given scenarios, as well as the results the multiple comparisons to better display differences of gender within the specific scenarios.

Post-hoc Least Squares Difference tests analyses revealed the differences between the groups based on target gender to be significant. Traditional gender roles for each character significantly differ from reverse gender roles for each character.

The purpose of the pilot study was to determine that the scenarios correctly depicted agentic and communal traits for each character. The characters were accurately assigned gendered characteristics according to traditional and reverse gender roles. These gendered traits appear to be neither obvious nor ambiguous for each character.

Table 1

Pilot study multiple comparisons of agency and communion within the scenarios.

	Scenario Version	Scenario Version	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>p</i>
Total Agency for Ashley	reverse gender/nonstalking	reverse gender/stalking	32	29.28	2.76	.416
		traditional gender/nonstalking	29	26.79	3.52	.072
		traditional gender/stalking	39	26.79	3.87	.056
	reverse gender/stalking	traditional gender/nonstalking	29	26.79	3.52	.006
		traditional gender/stalking	39	26.79	3.87	.003
	traditional gender/nonstalking	traditional gender/stalking	39	26.79	3.87	.998
Total Communion for Ashley	reverse gender/nonstalking	reverse gender/stalking	32	23.97	5.26	.030
		traditional gender/nonstalking	29	28.93	4.79	.000
		traditional gender/stalking	29	29.46	4.20	.000
	reverse gender/stalking	traditional gender/nonstalking	29	28.93	4.79	.000
		traditional gender/stalking	29	29.46	4.20	.000
	traditional gender/nonstalking	traditional gender/stalking	29	29.46	4.20	.632
Total Agency for Shawn	reverse gender/nonstalking	reverse gender/stalking	32	24.75	4.66	.015
		traditional gender/nonstalking	29	26.66	4.00	.000

		traditional gender/stalking	39	27.31	3.60	.000
	reverse gender/stalking	traditional gender/nonstalking	29	26.66	4.00	.053
		traditional gender/stalking	39	27.31	3.60	.006
	traditional gender/nonstalking	traditional gender/stalking	39	27.31	3.60	.486
<hr/>						
Total Communion for Shawn	reverse gender/nonstalking	reverse gender/stalking	25	28.84	4.72	.003
		traditional gender/nonstalking	29	21.86	4.27	.000
		traditional gender/stalking	39	20.08	4.13	.000
	reverse gender/stalking	traditional gender/nonstalking	29	21.86	4.27	.009
		traditional gender/stalking	39	20.08	4.13	.000
	traditional gender/nonstalking	traditional gender/stalking	39	20.08	4.13	.123
<hr/>						

CHAPTER III: GENDER IDENTITY ON JUDGMENTS OF STALKING

Method

Participants. Participants were recruited on-line ($N = 476$). Undergraduate students in the Psychology Department participant pool at a large public university were invited to participate in the study and were offered course credit in return for participating ($n = 440$). These participants were recruited through the on-line participant management system. Additional participants were recruited from websites such as Facebook (<http://www.facebook.com>) ($n = 22$) and the Social Psychology Network (<http://www.socialpsychology.org>) ($n = 6$). Participants who found the study on Facebook and the Social Psychology Network participated based on their interest in the topic. Some participants did not list where they found the link to participate in the study ($n = 8$). Participants were required to be at least 18 years or older to participate in this study ($M = 18.86$, $SD = 1.61$). Participants who were not at least 18 years old ($n = 6$) or who had large amounts of data missing ($n = 88$) were excluded from the study.

Overall, more women ($n = 349$) than men ($n = 126$) participated in this study. Men and women had similar trends in regards to gender identity. On average men had greater communal scores ($M = 30.08$, $SD = 4.10$) than agency scores ($M = 29.00$, $SD = 4.46$). Women also had a tendency to have slightly higher communal scores ($M = 32.80$, $SD = 4.19$) than agency scores ($M = 27.43$, $SD = 4.69$).

In regards to ethnicity, 78.8% of the participants listed themselves as Caucasian (non-Latino or Hispanic), 12.0% as African-American/Black, 3.6% as Hispanic/Latino, 3.4% as Asian-American/Pacific Islander, 1.5% as Multiracial, 0.4% as Native American, 0.2% as Middle Eastern, and 0.2% as "other."

Relationship status responses demonstrate that 46.8% of participants said that they were single, 41.2% of participants said that they were in a committed dating relationship, 10.3% of participants indicated that they were in a casual relationship, 1.5% of participants were married and only 0.2% of participants selected separated as their relationship status. The majority of participants indicated that they considered themselves to be heterosexual (95.8%). Only 1.1% of participants listed themselves as a lesbian, 0.2% of participants considered themselves to be gay men, 1.1% of participants listed themselves as bisexual, and 1.9% of participants were questioning their sexual identity.

Design. A 2 (participant gender: agentic, communal) x 2 (target gender: agentic, communal) x 2 (participant sex: male, female) x 2 (severity: stalking, non-stalking) participant x environment mixed group factorial design was used to test the hypotheses.

Procedure. Participants were directed to the survey web site and were prompted to provide informed consent and acknowledge that they had read the consent form and agreed to participate. After providing consent, participants were presented with one of four scenarios to read. After reading the scenario, participants answered questions about the scenario.

After reading and answering questions about the scenario, participants were either presented with the Extended Personnel Attributes Questionnaire or the Stalking Myth Scale. Participants were randomly assigned to answer one of these two questionnaires first. This is because the Stalking Myth Scale may prime participants as to the nature of the study. Participants then completed whichever scale they were not originally presented. For example, if participants completed the Extended Personnel

Attributes Questionnaire first, they completed the Stalking Myth Scale during this time and vice versa.

Participants were asked to answer general demographic and general information questions. Once they were finished with the survey, they were directed to a debriefing page.

Materials. The (EPAQ: Spence, Helmreich, & Holahan, 1979) measured the participants' gender identity. In The EPAQ was used in a pilot test as a means to create the gender of the characters in each scenario. The EPAQ is a continuous measure which examines how much participants identify as agentic, communal or are a combination of the two. The two subscales used in this study are the agency and communion subscales. Cronbach's alphas for the agency subscale was .72 and the Cronbach's alpha for the communion subscale was .76.

The Stalking Myth Scale was used (SMS: Sinclair, 2006) to measure participants' endorsement of common stalking myths. There are 21 statements in the SMS, with a 6-point Likert response scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). The SMS has a Cronbach's alpha of .78. The following are examples of questions from the Stalking Myth Scale, "People don't usually intend to harass or stalk others, but sometimes they get too carried away" and "Real stalking is when the stalker is a stranger." Higher scores indicate greater agreement with stalking myths.

The scenarios in this study are exactly the same as in the pilot test. The four different scenarios were randomly selected to appear. Participants only read one scenario and answered questions about that particular scenario.

Stalking questions were presented following the scenarios. There were 26 different questions which were a collection of common stalking questions that appeared in previous studies that examined stalking and attribution (Morgan, Mullen, & Skitka, 2010; Phillips, Quirk, Rosenfeld, & O'Connor, 2004; Sheridan, Gillet, Davies, Blaauw, & Patel, 2003). The response scale ranged from 1 (not at all) to 7 (definitely). Scores indicate how much participants believe the scenario represents stalking.

A principal components analysis using oblique rotation was conducted for the purpose of determining which questions best represent perceptions of stalking. The analysis yielded a five component solution, which was evaluated by examining eigenvalues, extraction and rotation sums of squared loadings, and item-total correlations. After rotation, the first component accounted for approximately 35% of the overall variance in the original variables; the second factor accounted for approximately 9% of the total variance, respectively. The third component only accounted for 6.9% of the total variance, the fourth component accounted for 6.4% of the variance and the fifth component accounted for approximately 4.6% of the total variance.

Component one consisted of fifteen items that dealt with the seriousness of the situation. This factor was labeled Seriousness because the variables examine the severity of the situation and what type of actions the victim might need to take in order to remain safe. Cronbach's alpha for component one was .95. The second component consisted of five items that examined the extent to which the victim and perpetrator could have handled the situation. This factor dealt with the extent to which Ashley, and to a lesser extent Shawn, dealt with the situation. The second component was labeled Handling the Situation. Cronbach's alpha for component two was .57. The third

component consisted of six items and these items examined how much personal control Shawn and Ashley had in the situation. Thus, this component has been labeled Personal Control. Cronbach's alpha for the third component was .61. The fourth component consisted of five components which dealt with the amount of control Shawn was unable to exert any control over the situation; this factor has been labeled Unable to Control. Cronbach's alpha for the fourth component was .28. Finally, the fifth component was comprised of 4 items which examined if Shawn could have done a better job controlling the situation. This factor has been labeled Better Control and had a Cronbach's alpha of .51.

The factor structure is quite complex and several variables loaded onto more than one factor. Rather than creating multiple subscales that shared similar variables, one total score was created. In order to obtain a total score, the item-total correlations were examined to determine which questions needed to be reversed and which questions could be eliminated. After examining the item-total correlations it was determined that three scores needed to be reversed-scored to accurately represent the meaning of the question. The three questions that were reversed scored were the following: "How responsible is Ashley for this situation?", "Should Ashley meet with Shawn?", "To what extent was Ashley's behavior under her personal control?" Five items were removed from the scale to increase the overall reliability of the measure. The five items removed were the following: "To what extent can Ashley protect herself in this situation?", "To what extent was Shawn's behavior under his personal control?", "To what extent were Ashley's behaviors an inevitable consequence of breaking up?", "To what extent were Shawn's behaviors an inevitable consequence of breaking up?", "To

what extent was Shawn's behavior due to aspects of the situation he could not personally control?" These questions are primarily attribution questions, after further examination of the questions, the interpretations of each question may be ambiguous. Cronbach's alpha on the new stalking scale with twenty- one items was .91.

Results

Regression analysis was used to examine whether target gender, participant gender identity, and severity of the incident predicted judgments of stalking. The hypotheses were 1) participants would judge the situation as more likely to be stalking when the victim had a communal gender identity than an agentic gender identity; 2) participants would also judge a situation as more likely to be stalking if severe pursuit behaviors were present rather than mild pursuit behaviors, and 3) participants with a communal gender identity would judge a situation as stalking more than participants with an agentic gender identity. A regression analysis was computed because participant gender identity was a continuous predictor and target gender identity and severity were both dichotomous variables. The regression analysis indicates that at least one of the hypothesized variables significantly predicted judgments of stalking $F(3, 392) = 55.23, p = .001$. Specifically, the severity of the situation significantly predicted participants' judgments of stalking. Target and participant gender identity did not significantly predict judgments of stalking. The complete results of the regression are presented in Table 2, standardized beta values for the predictor variables are also included in the table.

Table 2

Regressions with target gender, participant gender and severity to predict judgments of stalking.

Outcome variable	Predictor variable	<i>B</i>	<i>p</i>
Perceptions of Stalking			
	Scenario Severity	.67	.001*
	Target Gender	-.14	.70
	Participant Agency	-.15	.21
	Participant Communion	.03	.77
	Participant Agency by Target Gender Interaction	.30	.25
	Participant Communion by Target Gender Interaction	-.13	.67

* $p < .001$

The final hypothesis predicted that men and women would have differential endorsements of stalking myths. An independent samples t-test was used to examine whether men and women have differential endorsement of stalking myths. Men ($M = 70.99$, $SD = 9.94$) significantly endorsed more stalking myths than women ($M = 64.27$, $SD = 11.86$), $t(473) = 5.68$, $p < .001$, $d = .60$, 95% CI [.38, 80].

Correlational analyses were also completed to determine if the two different gender identities, communion and agency, would contribute to differential endorsements of stalking myths. Agency and endorsements of stalking myths were not significantly correlated, $r = -.03$, $p = .55$. Communion and endorsements of stalking myths were not significantly correlated either, $r = -.03$, $p = .48$

Although not hypothesized, an independent samples t-test tested whether men and women significantly differed on judgments of stalking. Men ($M = 88.11$, $SD = 18.81$) did not significantly differ from women ($M = 84.90$, $SD = 21.86$) in their judgments of stalking $t(407) = 1.36$, $p = .17$, $d = .14$, 95% CI [-.06, .35]. An independent samples t-test was also conducted to determine if the presentation order of the Extended Personal Attributes Questionnaire (EPAQ) and the Stalking Myth Scale (SMS) caused a significant difference in judgments of stalking. The presentation order of the EPAQ ($M = 85.27$, $SD = 21.39$) and the SMS ($M = 86.29$, $SD = 20.86$) did not significantly influence any differences in judgments of stalking $t(407) = -.49$, $p = .63$.

CHAPTER IV: GENERAL DISCUSSION

The goal of this study was to determine whether gender identity influences when a situation may be labeled as stalking. In other words, does gender identity help shape people's ideas of what can and should be considered stalking? Unfortunately, gender identity for both the target and participant was not influential in determining whether or not a situation was considered to be stalking. I originally predicted that traditional gender roles, manipulated through a communal female character and an agentic male character, would be more likely to cause participants to judge the situation as stalking than when the target characters depicted reversed gender roles. However, neither the traditional nor the reverse-role scenarios changed how participants judged a hypothetical stalking scenario of a romantic relationship that contained pursuit behaviors. The hypothesis that participants who had communal gender identities would be more likely to judge a situation as stalking than participants with agentic gender identities was not supported. Agentic and communal participants did not differ in their judgments of a situation as stalking or not stalking. In addition to participant gender identity, participant sex was not a useful predictor for examining judgments of stalking. However, the second hypothesis said that severe pursuit would be judged as stalking more so than mild pursuit behaviors was supported.

Some researchers have found differences in perceptions of stalking scenarios based on sex (Dennison & Thomson, 2002; Hills & Taplin, 1998; Phillips et al., 2004; Sheridan & Scott, 2010) while other studies have found no sex differences (Sheridan, Gillett & Davies, 2002; Sheridan et al., 2003). The results of this study fall in line with past findings when sex does not seem to make a difference in judgments of stalking.

However, because of the conflicting literature, one cannot rule out the idea that sex does in fact play a role in judgments of stalking. One possible explanation for the current results is that men and women agree on what does or does not constitute stalking, as do people who are communal or agentic. Unlike previous studies that also manipulated the relationship of the targets and the sex of the targets (Hills & Taplin, 1998; Sheridan & Scott, 2010), this study did not examine how target sex and relationship might alter perceptions of stalking. Researchers have found that men and women differ when the sex of the targets are changed; women, more so than men, tend to feel that male perpetrators warrant more concern for the female victim than male perpetrators (Sheridan & Scott, 2010). Men are typically more likely to be perpetrators of severe stalking (Spitzberg & Cupach, 2007) and even though both men and women are likely to be perpetrators of relational stalking, women are still more likely to be victims of relational stalking as well (Baum et al, 2009; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998; Yanowitz, 2006). Future examinations of gender identity should also manipulate sex of the perpetrator and victim. Paired with the severity of the situation, common gender roles and sex roles, participants may have been influenced by common gendered schemas and ideas that men are more likely to stalk women, which were portrayed in both scenarios.

The relationship between the targets might have also altered perceptions of stalking. Stranger stalking is viewed as a more serious offense than relational stalking (Hills & Taplin, 1998). Participants may have felt that the perpetrator was entitled to pursue the victim because of their previous relationship, but causing fear was one step too far. It would be interesting to examine the relationship between the victim and

perpetrator, in addition to manipulating the gender identities and sex of both the victim and the perpetrator in future studies.

While the main predictions regarding gender identity are somewhat disappointing, there were interesting results as well. I found that participants judged severe pursuit behaviors as stalking more so than mild pursuit behaviors. Severity was such a strong determinant that it may have actually canceled out any potential results that could have been attributed to gender identity differences. In other words, when the pursuit behaviors were so severe that they clearly depicted stalking behaviors, it was consistently viewed as stalking regardless of the characters' gender identity. Mild pursuit behaviors that did not constitute stalking were consistently rated as less likely to be stalking than an actual stalking situation. A ceiling effect occurred, which means that the majority of scores for severity were at the maximum value possible. When a ceiling effect occurs, it is very difficult to find differing scores that could allude to different effects. However, it is interesting to note that both levels of severity included pursuit behaviors. Such behaviors included the perpetrator calling the potential victim on the phone and making attempts to meet up with the potential victim. Slight variations were made to the stalking scenario to allude that it was more serious, such as the victim experiencing fear as a result of the repeated pursuit behaviors. The mention of fear may have had such a strong influence on how participants perceived the situation that it would be considered stalking regardless of target gender identity or participant gender identity. In the future it would be interesting to examine if changing the target sex could influence judgments of stalking while also eliminating such obvious indicators, such as victim fear, for determining the severity of a stalking situation.

In addition to severity being a useful predictor for how people endorse stalking myths, there was another interesting finding in the current study. Men and women, independent of gender identity, differed in their endorsements of stalking myths. Stalking myths, similar to rape myths, blame the victim, thus making the perpetrator less responsible for his or her actions in accordance with the just world theory (Sheridan et al, 2003). Men were more likely to endorse stalking myths than women; this is consistent with the literature on rape myths (Suarez & Gadalla, 2010). These results suggest that men, more so than women, believe that the victim is at least in part responsible for being stalked. The just world theory infers that victims are somehow responsible for being stalked because the victim must have done something to provoke the perpetrator's behaviors (Sheridan et al., 2003).

There are several limitations in this study. The severity of the situation was such a strong predictor that probably it canceled out any other potential significant results. Even though participants only read one scenario and thus could not compare a stalking scenario to a non-stalking scenario, the situation with stalking appeared so severe that any gender identity differences would not matter. The situation would have been labeled as stalking no matter what other manipulations were present. Target participant gender identities would not have been able to be taken into greater consideration because the stalking scenario was blatantly stalking, at least according to most participant responses.

Another limitation is that there is not a general measure that is used for most studies to measure perceptions of stalking. A better measure needs to be created with questions that are more direct and that have clear meanings. A follow-up study to this

initial study would be very beneficial. Future studies could also examine gender identity and sex keeping the stalking severity constant. That is, the scenario would always depict stalking, which would rule out any other options for why the situation may or may not be stalking. A new measure would also be necessary for the purpose of examining perceptions of stalking. It might also be useful to examine the relationship between gender schematic and gender aschematic participants' judgments of stalking.

In conclusion, the results of this study are compatible with some past findings, particularly previous findings that conclude that sex does not influence perceptions of stalking. However, there currently are not any other studies that examine participant and target gender identity as predictors for judgments of stalking, so one cannot say that this current research is or is not compatible with all research. More research is required to understand the underpinnings of relational stalking and the role that gender identity and sex might play in determining how people view stalking.

REFERENCES

- American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Battaglia, D., Richard, F., Datteri, D., & Lord, C. (1998). Breaking up is (relatively) easy to do: A script for the dissolution of close relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 15*, 829-845.
- Baum, K., Catalano, S., Rand, M., & Rose, K. (2009). Stalking victimization in the United States. *Bureau of Justice Statistics, Special Report*, 1-15.
- Bem, S. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review APA, 88*, 354-363.
- Brewster, M. (2003). Power and control dynamics in prestalking and stalking situations. *Journal of Family Violence, 18*, 207-217.
- Carli, L.L. (1999). Cognitive reconstruction, hindsight, and reactions to victims and perpetrators. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25*, 966-979.
- Choo, P., Levine, T., & Hatfield, E. (1996). Gender, love schemas, and reactions to romantic break-ups. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 11*, 143-160.
- Cupach, W. & Spitzber, B. (2000). Obsessive relational intrusion: incident, perceived severity, and coping. *Violence and Victims, 15*, 1–16.
- 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*, 407–425.
- Dennison, S. M.; Thomson, D. M. (2002). Identifying stalking: The relevance of intent in commonsense reasoning. *Law and Human Behavior, 26*, 543-561.

- Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs (2001). Stalking and domestic violence: Report to Congress. Washington, D. C.: National Criminal Justice Reference Service, #186157.
- Diamond, M. (2000). Sex and gender: Same or different? *Feminism & Psychology, 10*, 46-54.
- Dietz, N. A., & Martin, Y. A. (2007). Women who are stalked: Questioning the fear standard. *Violence Against Women, 13*, 750-776.
- Dunn, J. L. (1999). What love has to do with it: The cultural construction of emotion and sorority women's responses to forcible interaction. *Social Problems, 46*, 440-459.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eagley, A.H. (2009). The his and hers of prosocial behavior: An examination of the social psychology of gender. *American Psychologist, 64*, 644-658.
- Emerson, R. M., Ferris, K. O., & Gardner, C. B. (1998). On being stalked. *Social Problems, 45*, 289-314.
- Falbo, T. & Peplau, L.A. (1980). Power strategies in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*, 618-628.
- Higgins, E. Tory; Rholes, William S.; Jones, Carl R. (1977). Category accessibility and impression formation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 13*, 141-154.
- Hills, A.M. & Taplin, J.L. (1998) Anticipated responses to stalking: Effect of threat and target-stalker relationship. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law, 5*, 139-146.

- Holmberg, D. & MacKenzie, S. (2002). So far so good: Scripts for romantic relationship development as predictors of relational well-being. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 19*, 777-796.
- Jacques-Tiura, A. J., Abbey, A., Parkhill, M. R., & Zawacki, T. (2007). Why do some men misperceive women's sexual intentions more frequently than others do? An application of the confluence model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*, 1467-1480.
- Kluwer, E., de Dreu, C., & Buunk, B. (1998). Conflict in intimate vs. non-intimate relationships: When gender role stereotyping overrides biased self-other judgment. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 15*, 637-650.
- Kowalski, R. (1993). Inferring sexual interest from behavioral cues: Effects of gender and sexually relevant attitudes. *Sex roles, 29*, 13-35.
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Palarea, R. E., Cohen, J., & Rohling, M. L. (2000). Breaking up is hard to do: Unwanted pursuit behaviors following the dissolution of a romantic relationship. *Violence and Victims, 15*, 73-90.
- Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1994). Rape myths: In review. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 18*, 133-164.
- Markus, H. R. (1977). Self-schemata and processing information about the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35*, 63 – 78.
- Melton, H. (2009). Stalking in the context of intimate partner abuse: In the victim's words. *Feminist Criminology, 2*, 347-363.

- Morgan, G.S., Mullen, E., & Skitka, L.J. (2010). When values and attributions collide: Liberals' and Conservatives' values motivate attributions for alleged misdeeds. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36, 1241–1254.
- National Criminal Justice Association (1993). *Project to develop a model anti-stalking code for states*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- National Center for Victims of Crime (2007). *The model stalking code revisited: Responding to the new realities of stalking*. Washington, DC: National Center for Victims of Crime.
- Phillips, L., Quirk, R., Rosenfeld, B., & O'Connor, M. (2004). Is it stalking? Perceptions of stalking among college undergraduates. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 31, 73-96.
- Rubin, Z., & Peplau, L.A. (1975). "Who Believes in a Just World," *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 31, No. 3, 1975, pp. 65-89.
- Rudman, L.A., & Glick, P. (2008). *The social psychology of gender: How power and intimacy shape gender relations*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Sheridan, L., Gillet, R., Davies, G., Blaauw, E., & Patel, D. (2003). 'There's no smoke without fire': Are male ex-partners perceived as more 'entitled' to stalk than acquaintance or stranger stalkers? *British Journal of Psychology*, 94, 87-98.
- Sheridan, L., Gillett, R., & Davies, G. (2002). *Perceptions and prevalence of stalking in a male sample*. *Psychology, Crime and Law*, 8, 289-310.
- Sheridan, L. & Scott, A. (2010). Perceptions of harm: Verbal versus physical abuse in stalking scenarios. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37, 400-416.

- Sinclair, H. C. (2006). Stalking myth-conceptions: Consequences of myth endorsement for the perception of stalking cases. Paper presented as part of symposium titled Advances in Research on Stalking at the American Psychology-Law Society 2006 conference in St. Petersburg, FL. (Study 1: $\alpha = .82$, $n = 103$, Study 2: $\alpha = .80$, $n = 341$).
- Sinclair, C. & Frieze, I. (2005). When courtship persistence becomes intrusive pursuit: comparing rejecter and pursuer perspectives of unrequited attraction. *Sex roles*, 52, 839-850.
- Sinclair & Lyndon (under review): Stalking in the courts: An archival examination of legal outcomes in stalking cases
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L., & Holahan, C. K. (1979) Negative and positive components of psychological masculinity and femininity and their relationships to self-reports of neurotic and acting out behaviors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1673-1682.
- Spitzberg, B. & Cupach, W. (2007). The state of the art of stalking: Taking stock of the emerging literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 12, 64-86.
- Suarez, E & Gadalla, T. (2010). Stop Blaming the Victim: A Meta-Analysis on Rape Myths. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25, 2010-2035.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1998). Stalking in America: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey (No. NCJ 169592). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

- Tobin, D., Menon, M., Menon, M., Spatta, B., Hodges, E. & Perry, D. (2010). The intrapsychics of gender: A model of self-socialization. *Psychological Review*, 117, 601-622.
- White, J., Kowalski, R., Lyndon, A., & Valentine, S. (2000). An integrative contextual developmental model of male stalking. *Violence and Victims*, 15, 373-384.
- Williams, S. & Frieze, I. (2005). Courtship behaviors, relationship violence, and breakup Persistence in college men and women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 29, 248- 257.
- Yanowitz, K. (2006). Influence of gender and experience on college students' stalking schemas. *Violence and Victims*, 21, 91-100.
- Zadny, J., & Gerard, H.B. (1974). Attributed intentions and informational selectivity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 10, 34-52.

APPENDIX A: IRB DOCUMENTATION



EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY

University & Medical Center Institutional Review Board Office
1L-09 Brody Medical Sciences Building • 600 Moye Boulevard • Greenville, NC 27834
Office 252-744-2914 • Fax 252-744-2284 • www.ecu.edu/irb

Date: April 22, 2010

Principal Investigator: Ellen Ratajack
3940 Bostic Dr., 305 B
Greenville, NC 27834

RE: Exempt Certification *KX*
UMCIRB# 10-0212
Funding Source: Unfunded

Title: Pilot Testing Story Characteristics of Difficult Relationships

Dear Ellen Ratajack:

On 4.19.10, the University & Medical Center Institutional Review Board (UMCIRB) determined that your research meets ECU requirements and federal exemption criterion #2 which includes research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior.

It is your responsibility to ensure that this research is conducted in the manner reported in your Internal Processing Form and Protocol, as well as being consistent with the ethical principles of the Belmont Report and your profession.

This research study does not require any additional interaction with the UMCIRB unless there are proposed changes to this study. Any change, prior to implementing that change, must be submitted to the UMCIRB for review and approval. The UMCIRB will determine if the change impacts the eligibility of the research for exempt status. If more substantive review is required, you will be notified within five business days.

The UMCIRB Office will hold your exemption application for a period of five years from the date of this letter. If you wish to continue this protocol beyond this period, you will need to submit an Exemption Certification Request at least 30 days before the end of the five year period.

Sincerely,

Chairperson, University & Medical Center Institutional Review Board

Cc: Amy Lyndon, PhD



EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY

University & Medical Center Institutional Review Board Office
1L-09 Brody Medical Sciences Building • 600 Moye Boulevard • Greenville, NC 27834
Office 252-744-2914 • Fax 252-744-2284 • www.ecu.edu/irb

TO: Ellen Ratajack, B.A., Graduate Student, Dept. of Psychology, ECU
FROM: UMCIRB *KWB*
DATE: October 21, 2010
RE: Expedited Category Research Study
TITLE: "Perceptions of the Termination of Romantic Relationships"

UMCIRB #10-0571

This research study has undergone review and approval using expedited review on 10/18/2010. This research study is eligible for review under an expedited category number 7 because it is research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior), or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus groups, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies. (NOTE: some research in this category may be exempt from the HHS regulations for the protection of human subjects 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) and (b)(3). This listing refers only to research that is not exempt. The Chairperson (or designee) deemed this **unfunded** study **no more than minimal risk** requiring a continuing review in **12 months**. Changes to this approved research may not be initiated without UMCIRB review except when necessary to eliminate an apparent immediate hazard to the participant. All unanticipated problems involving risks to participants and others must be promptly reported to the UMCIRB. The investigator must submit a continuing review/closure application to the UMCIRB prior to the date of study expiration. The investigator must adhere to all reporting requirements for this study.

The above referenced research study has been given approval for the period of **10/18/2010 to 10/17/2011**. The approval includes the following items:

- Internal Processing Form (date 10/07/2010)
- Online Informed consent (UMCIRB receipt date 10/13/2010)
- Scenario Scripts (UMCIRB receipt date 10/13/2010)
- Surveys/Questionnaires (UMCIRB receipt date 10/13/2010)
- Debriefing Form (UMCIRB receipt date 10/13/2010)

The Chairperson (or designee) does not have a potential for conflict of interest on this study.

The UMCIRB applies 45 CFR 46, Subparts A-D, to all research reviewed by the UMCIRB regardless of the funding source. 21 CFR 50 and 21 CFR 56 are applied to all research studies under the Food and Drug Administration regulation. The UMCIRB follows applicable International Conference on Harmonisation Good Clinical Practice guidelines.

APPENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT STUDY I

Informed Consent to Participate in Research

Information to consider before taking part in research that has no more than minimal risk.

Title of Research Study: Pilot testing story characteristics of difficult relationships

Principal Investigator: Ellen Ratajack

Institution/Department or Division: East Carolina University, Psychology Department

Address: 3940 Bostic Drive, Greenville, NC 27834

Telephone #: 219-512-3511

Researchers at East Carolina University (ECU) study problems in society, health problems, environmental problems, behavior problems and the human condition. Our goal is to try to find ways to improve the lives of you and others. To do this, we need the help of people who are willing to take part in research.

The person who is in charge of this research is called the Principal Investigator. You may have questions that this form does not answer. If you do, feel free to ask the person explaining the study, as you go along. You may have questions later and you should ask those questions, as you think of them. There is no time limit for asking questions about this research.

You do not have to take part in this research. Take your time and think about the information that is provided. If you want, have a friend or family member go over this form with you before you decide. It is up to you. If you choose to be in the study, then you should sign the form when you are comfortable that you understand the information provided. If you do not want to take part in the study, you should not sign this form. That decision is yours and it is okay to decide not to volunteer.

Why is this research being done?

The purpose of this research is to test materials that will be used in a future study. I am testing whether I correctly described the personality traits of characters in a relationship story. The decision to take part in this research is yours to make. By doing this

research, we hope to learn how certain behaviors or characteristics of an individual are perceived.

Why am I being invited to take part in this research?

You are being invited to take part in this research because you have volunteered to participate in this study. If you volunteer to take part in this research, you will be one of about 100 people to do so.

Are there reasons I should not take part in this research?

Please understand that you should not participate in this study if you are under the age of 18.

What other choices do I have if I do not take part in this research?

You have the choice of not taking part in this research study. Your choice to participate is completely voluntary and if you decide that you do not want to participate once you begin to take the survey, you may leave at no cost to you.

Where is the research going to take place and how long will it last?

The research procedures will be conducted online. If you choose to participate, you will be directed to an online survey. The total amount of time you will be asked to volunteer for this study is 25 minutes.

What will I be asked to do?

You are being asked to do the following: Read a short scenario regarding a relationship between two people. You will be asked to fill out two surveys (one for each character) based on how you view the personality traits of the two characters.

What possible harms or discomforts might I experience if I take part in the research?

There are always risks (the chance of harm) when taking part in research. It has been determined that the risks associated with this research are no more than what you would experience in a normal life. However, some people react to things differently so it is important for you to tell us as quickly as possible if you experience any negative feelings.

What are the possible benefits I may experience from taking part in this research?

We do not know if you will get any benefits by taking part in this study. This research might help us learn more about perceptions of certain characteristics that will eventually

be used in future research. There may be no personal benefit from your participation but the information gained by doing this research may help others in the future.

Will I be paid for taking part in this research?

We will not be able to pay you for the time you volunteer while being in this study. However you will receive 0.5 research credits for participating in this study.

What will it cost me to take part in this research?

It will not cost you any money to be part of the research.

Who will know that I took part in this research and learn personal information about me?

To do this research, ECU and the people and organizations listed below may know that you took part in this research and may see information about you that is normally kept private. With your permission, these people may use your private information to do this research:

- The principal investigator
- The University & Medical Center Institutional Review Board (UMCIRB) and its staff, who have responsibility for overseeing your welfare during this research, and other ECU staff who oversee this research.

How will you keep the information you collect about me secure? How long will you keep it?

The survey that you fill out will be kept in a secure, password protected file for 5 years. After 5 years have passed, these documents will be destroyed. Your name will not be attached to your responses in anyway so all responses are strictly anonymous.

What if I decide I do not want to continue in this research?

If you decide you no longer want to be in this research after it has already started, you may stop at any time. You will not be penalized or criticized for stopping. You will not lose any benefits that you should normally receive.

What if I get sick or hurt while I am in this research?

This study does not involve any risk greater than what you experience in everyday life. Therefore, we do not expect you to become sick or hurt as a result of being part of this research.

Who should I contact if I have questions?

The people conducting this study will be available to answer any questions concerning this research, now or in the future. You may contact the Principal Investigator at 219-512-3511 weekdays between 9:00 am and 5:00 pm.

If you have questions about your rights as someone taking part in research, you may call the UMCIRB Office at phone number 252-744-2914 (days, 8:00 am-5:00 pm). If you would like to report a complaint or concern about this research study, you may call the Director of UMCIRB Office, at 252-744-1971.

Is there anything else I should know?

Your time and volunteer efforts are greatly appreciated. By participating in this study you are helping contribute to future research in the field of psychology.

I have decided I want to take part in this research. What should I do now?

The person obtaining informed consent will ask you to read the following and if you agree, you can participate in this study:

- I have read (or had read to me) all of the above information.
- I have had an opportunity to ask questions about things in this research I did not understand and have received satisfactory answers.
- I understand that I can stop taking part in this study at any time.
- By agreeing to participate in this study I am not giving up any of my rights.
- I am able to print a copy of this consent document, and it is mine to keep.

Yes. I would like to participate in this study.

No. I do not want to participate in this study.

APPENDIX C: TRADITIONAL GENDER ROLES NON-STALKING SCENARIO

Instructions: Please read the following scenario.

Shawn and Ashley began dating the summer between their junior and senior years in high school. They met at a friend's beach party and immediately felt a connection. Shawn approached Ashley first and he was instantly attracted to her polite and warm personality. They went on several dates after meeting at the party, such as going to the movies and out for ice cream. Ashley expected Shawn to pay for her portion of the date and he never expected her to offer to pay when they went out. She found it easy to devote a lot of time to him because she made it a point to put him first.

Once the summer ended, Shawn and Ashley continued to date throughout the school year. Ashley often spent time with Shawn after school and she would often bake cookies and help him clean his room. However, there were times when Shawn did not make time to see Ashley after school, she would become very upset. She understood that Shawn had other obligations, such as going to football practice, but believed that he needed to spend as much time with her as possible. Shawn felt that he needed more time with his friends and did not want to miss out on "guy time" which included weekly poker nights. Ashley had a schedule of her own, and was often busy as captain of the dance team. Although she was busy, she wanted to spend more time with Shawn.

Over spring break, Shawn went on a trip to Florida with his family. He said he would try to call her each day while he was away. Eventually, spring break ended and Ashley did not hear from Shawn once. Shawn did not feel that it was necessary to call Ashley and wasn't concerned that her feelings may be hurt as a result, besides he did

not have a strong cell phone signal. He would answer occasionally when she called him, but she felt hurt that he did not make an effort to call her. Either way, Ashley understood that he was probably busy spending quality time with his family and she was busy spending time with her friends and was focused on an upcoming dance competition.

After spring break, Ashley received a letter of congratulations from her top school of choice for college. She was excited to be accepted because it was an excellent school and in a very nice location. Ashley needed to take this opportunity, but she was concerned about how Shawn might feel about her going to a school so far away. She would miss him a lot but she wasn't sure if the relationship could handle such a great distance. She made up her mind to go there after a great deal of hesitation.

Once the school year was over, Ashley ended the relationship with Shawn. She explained that she was going to a university that was about 12 hours away from her home town, and it would make seeing Shawn difficult. Ashley made it clear that she was not interested in dating anymore because it would be the best option for both of them. Shawn was upset when the relationship ended. He tried calling Ashley a few times to talk to her about the separation, and at first she spoke to him about her reasons for ending the relationship. She told him that even though she thought it would be too difficult to date they could remain friends. Shawn called Ashley less and less. They continued to talk a few times if they ran into each other, but their conversations usually included little more than small talk. Shawn asked to see Ashley once before she left for school, she said no. Shawn had thought about going to Ashley's house to see if she might change her mind and speak to him, but decided against it. Shawn wanted to see

Ashley and remain in contact because he would miss the relationship they shared. Ashley quickly moved on from the relationship because she was excited to start her college career. Ashley told Shawn that she was not interested in seeing him anymore. Shawn saw this response as Ashley's way of saying "it's over." She often hung out with her friends after work. After a very short amount of time, Shawn stopped calling Ashley because she did not return his calls or make plans to see him anymore.

APPENDIX D: TRADITIONAL GENDER ROLES STALKING SCENARIO

Instructions: Please read the following scenario.

Shawn and Ashley began dating the summer between their junior and senior years in high school. They met at a friend's beach party and immediately felt a connection. Shawn approached Ashley first and he was instantly attracted to her polite and warm personality. They went on several dates after meeting at the party, such as going to the movies and out for ice cream. Ashley expected Shawn to pay for her portion of the date and he never expected her to offer to pay when they went out. She found it easy to devote a lot of time to him because she made it a point to put him first.

Once the summer ended, Shawn and Ashley continued to date throughout the school year. Ashley often spent time with Shawn after school and she would often bake cookies and help him clean his room. However, there were times when Shawn did not make time to see Ashley after school, she would become very upset. She understood that Shawn had other obligations, such as going to football practice, but believed that he needed to spend as much time with her as possible. Shawn felt that he needed more time with his friends and did not want to miss out on "guy time" which included weekly poker nights. Ashley had a schedule of her own, and was often busy as captain of the dance team. Although she was busy, she wanted to spend more time with Shawn.

Over spring break, Shawn went on a trip to Florida with his family. He said he would try to call her each day while he was away. Eventually, spring break ended and Ashley did not hear from Shawn once. Shawn did not feel that it was necessary to call Ashley and wasn't concerned that her feelings may be hurt as a result, besides he did not have a strong cell phone signal. He would answer occasionally when she called

him, but she felt hurt that he did not make an effort to call her. Either way, Ashley understood that he was probably busy spending quality time with his family and she was busy spending time with her friends and was focused on an upcoming dance competition.

After spring break, Ashley received a letter of congratulations from her top school of choice for college. She was excited to be accepted because it was an excellent school and in a very nice location. Ashley needed to take this opportunity, but she was concerned about how Shawn might feel about her going to a school so far away. She would miss him a lot but she wasn't sure if the relationship could handle such a great distance. She made up her mind to go there after a great deal of hesitation.

Once the school year was over, Ashley ended the relationship with Shawn. She explained that she was going to a university that was about 12 hours away from her home town, and it would make seeing Shawn difficult. Ashley made it clear that she was not interested in dating anymore because it would be the best option for both of them. Shawn was upset when the relationship ended. He tried calling Ashley a few times to talk to her about the separation and at first she spoke to him about her reasons for ending the relationship. She told him that even though she thought it would be too difficult to date they could remain friends. Shawn began to call Ashley more and more every day for several weeks. Sometimes he would call with the intent to see where she was, who she was with and what she was doing. When Shawn asked to see Ashley again, she said no. However, he would go to Ashley's house, uninvited and waited for her to finish working at the town pool because he hoped she might change her mind and speak to him. Shawn wanted to see Ashley and remain in contact because he

would miss the relationship they shared. Ashley quickly moved on from the relationship because she was excited to start her college career. Ashley told Shawn that she was not interested in seeing him anymore and that he needed to leave her alone. Shawn saw this response as Ashley's way of saying "try harder". She often had her friends accompany her home after work in hopes that Shawn would get the hint and go away. He sent her flowers and gifts frequently after their last meeting, even though Ashley asked him not to contact her at all. One afternoon Ashley noticed Shawn following behind her in his car as she drove home from work. Ashley started to feel alarmed that Shawn would not listen to her when she told him to go away.

APPENDIX E: REVERSE GENDER ROLES NON-STALKING SCENARIO

Instructions: Please read the following scenario.

Shawn and Ashley began dating the summer between their junior and senior years in high school. They met at a friend's beach party and immediately felt a connection. Shawn waited for Ashley to approach him and he was instantly attracted to her confident and independent personality. They went on several dates after meeting at the party, such as going to the movies and out for ice cream. Ashley often insisted that she pay for her own portion of the date and Shawn expected her to pay for herself and sometimes his portion of the date. Ashley found it difficult to devote a lot of time to Shawn because she wanted to focus on herself.

Once the summer ended, Shawn and Ashley continued to date throughout the school year. Ashley often spent time with Shawn after school and Shawn would often help her clean her room and make her dinner. There were times when Shawn said he did not have time to see Ashley after school, she very rarely got upset. She understood that Shawn had other obligations, such as going to volleyball practice and they both needed their time apart. Shawn felt guilty that he could not always spend time with Ashley, but he promised to watch his nephew once a week after school while his sister went to work. Ashley had a schedule of her own and was often busy being captain of the soccer team. Although she was busy, she was not worried about spending more time with Shawn.

Over spring break, Shawn went on a trip to Florida with his family. He promised to call her each day while he was away. Eventually, spring break ended and Ashley did not hear from Shawn once. Shawn felt that it was necessary to call Ashley and was

concerned that her feelings may be hurt as a result, but he did not have a strong cell phone signal. He would answer occasionally when she called him and his lack of effort to call her did not bother her. He was probably busy spending quality time with his family. Ashley was busy spending time with her own friends and was focused on an upcoming soccer tournament.

After spring break, Ashley received a letter of congratulations from her top school of choice for college. She was excited to be accepted because it was an excellent school and in a very nice location. Ashley needed to take this opportunity and she was unconcerned about how Shawn might feel about her going to a school so far away. She supposed that she might miss him but she wasn't sure if the relationship could handle such a great distance. She made up her mind to go there without any hesitation.

Once the school year was over, Ashley ended the relationship with Shawn. She explained that she was going to a university that was about 12 hours away from her home town, and it would make seeing Shawn difficult. Ashley made it clear that she was not interested in dating anymore because it would be the best option for both of them. Shawn was upset when the relationship ended. He tried calling Ashley a few times to talk to her about the separation, and at first she spoke to him about her reasons for ending the relationship. She told him that even though she thought it would be too difficult to date they could remain friends. Shawn called Ashley less and less. They continued to talk a few times if they ran into each other, but their conversations usually included little more than small talk. Shawn asked to see Ashley once before she left for school, she said no. Shawn had thought about going to Ashley's house to see if she might change her mind and speak to him, but decided against it. Shawn wanted to see

Ashley and remain in contact because he would miss the relationship they shared. Ashley quickly moved on from the relationship because she was excited to start her college career. Ashley told Shawn that she was not interested in seeing him anymore. Shawn saw this response as Ashley's way of saying "it's over." She often hung out with her friends after work. After a very short amount of time, Shawn stopped calling Ashley because she did not return his calls or make plans to see him anymore.

APPENDIX F: REVERSE GENDER ROLES STALKING SCENARIO

Instructions: Please read the following scenario.

Shawn and Ashley began dating the summer between their junior and senior years in high school. They met at a friend's beach party and immediately felt a connection. Shawn waited for Ashley to approach him and he was instantly attracted to her confident and independent personality. They went on several dates after meeting at the party, such as going to the movies and out for ice cream. Ashley often insisted that she pay for her own portion of the date and Shawn expected her to pay for herself and sometimes his portion of the date. Ashley found it difficult to devote a lot of time to Shawn because she wanted to focus on herself.

Once the summer ended, Shawn and Ashley continued to date throughout the school year. Ashley often spent time with Shawn after school and Shawn would often help her clean her room and make her dinner. There were times when Shawn said he did not have time to see Ashley after school, she very rarely got upset. She understood that Shawn had other obligations, such as going to volleyball practice and they both needed their time apart. Shawn felt guilty that he could not always spend time with Ashley, but he promised to watch his nephew once a week after school while his sister went to work. Ashley had a schedule of her own and was often busy being captain of the soccer team. Although she was busy, she was not worried about spending more time with Shawn.

Over spring break, Shawn went on a trip to Florida with his family. He promised to call her each day while he was away. Eventually, spring break ended and Ashley did not hear from Shawn once. Shawn felt that it was necessary to call Ashley and was

concerned that her feelings may be hurt as a result, but he did not have a strong cell phone signal. He would answer occasionally when she called him and his lack of effort to call her did not bother her. He was probably busy spending quality time with his family. Ashley was busy spending time with her own friends and was focused on an upcoming soccer tournament.

After spring break, Ashley received a letter of congratulations from her top school of choice for college. She was excited to be accepted because it was an excellent school and in a very nice location. Ashley needed to take this opportunity and she was unconcerned about how Shawn might feel about her going to a school so far away. She supposed that she might miss him but she wasn't sure if the relationship could handle such a great distance. She made up her mind to go there without any hesitation.

Once the school year was over, Ashley ended the relationship with Shawn. She explained that she was going to a university that was about 12 hours away from her home town, and it would make seeing Shawn difficult. Ashley made it clear that she was not interested in dating anymore because it would be the best option for both of them. Shawn was upset when the relationship ended. He tried calling Ashley a few times to talk to her about the separation and at first she spoke to him about her reasons for ending the relationship. She told him that even though she thought it would be too difficult to date they could remain friends. Shawn began to call Ashley more and more every day for several weeks. Sometimes he would call with the intent to see where she was, who she was with and what she was doing. When Shawn asked to see Ashley again, she said no. However, he would go to Ashley's house, uninvited and waited for her to finish working at the town pool because he hoped she might change her mind

and speak to him. Shawn wanted to see Ashley and remain in contact because he would miss the relationship they shared. Ashley quickly moved on from the relationship because she was excited to start her college career. Ashley told Shawn that she was not interested in seeing him anymore and that he needed to leave her alone. Shawn saw this response as Ashley's way of saying "try harder". She often had her friends accompany her home after work in hopes that Shawn would get the hint and go away. He sent her flowers and gifts frequently after their last meeting, even though Ashley asked him not to contact her at all. One afternoon Ashley noticed Shawn following behind her in his car as she drove home from work. Ashley started to feel alarmed that Shawn would not listen to her when she told him to go away.

APPENDIX G: DEBRIEFING FORM STUDY I

The goal of the study you just participated in was to examine if the characters in the relationship story were accurately written to describe masculine and feminine personality traits. This study is a pilot test for future research and it is important to determine that these measures accurately portray gender identity and gender roles. These materials will be used in a future study that will examine gender traits and relationships. This research is important because it is necessary to first determine that materials are reliable and accurately portray what the researcher is looking to portray.

If you find that participating in this study has made you uncomfortable or caused some distress, the phone number for the ECU Center for Counseling and Student Development is 328-6661 and is located on the second floor of the Wright Building, Room 316, <http://www.ecu.edu/studentlife/counselingcenter/>. The counseling center offers individual and group counseling, and also offers workshops on the following topics: Adjusting to College, Coping with Grief and Loss Issues, Stress Management, Assertiveness Training, Communicating and Resolving Conflict, Self-Esteem Boosters and Busters.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study or your rights as a research participant and would like to talk to someone other than the researchers, contact the Chair of the University and Medical Center Institutional Review Board at (252) 744-2914. If you have any questions about the study, please feel free to call either Ellen Ratajack at (219) 512-3511 or e-mail at er0410@ecu.edu.

APPENDIX H: INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT STUDY II

Informed Consent to Participate in Research

Information to consider before taking part in research that has no more than minimal risk.

Title of Research Study: Perceptions of the termination of romantic relationships

Principal Investigator: Ellen Ratajack

Institution/Department or Division: East Carolina University, Department of Psychology

Address: Rawl 104, East Carolina University

E-mail: ~~ratajacke09@students.ecu.edu~~ _____

Researchers at East Carolina University (ECU) study problems in society, health problems, environmental problems, behavior problems and the human condition. Our goal is to try to find ways to improve the lives of you and others. To do this, we need the help of volunteers who are willing to take part in research.

Why is this research being done?

The purpose of this research is to examine people's ideas about romantic relationships, especially once a relationship has ended. The decision to take part in this research is yours to make. By doing this research, we hope to learn what people think is appropriate when other people end a romantic relationship.

Why am I being invited to take part in this research?

You are being invited to take part in this research because you have volunteered to participate in this study. If you volunteer to take part in this research, you will be one of about 500 people to do so at East Carolina and nationally.

Are there reasons I should not take part in this research?

Please understand that you should not participate in this study if you are under the age of 18.

What other choices do I have if I do not take part in this research?

You can choose not to participate. Your choice to participate is completely voluntary and if you decide that you do not want to participate once you begin to take the survey, you may leave at no cost to you.

Where is the research going to take place and how long will it last?

The research procedures will be conducted online. If you choose to participate, you will be directed to an online survey. You may wish to take the survey in a private location during the duration of this study. The total amount of time you will be asked to volunteer for this study is about 30-45 minutes.

What will I be asked to do?

You are being asked to do the following: read a short scenario about two people in a relationship, answer questions about the relationship, answer two short surveys and some basic questions about yourself. All of your responses are strictly for research purposes and all responses are anonymous.

What possible harms or discomforts might I experience if I take part in the research?

It has been determined that the risks associated with this research are no more than what you would experience in everyday life.

What are the possible benefits I may experience from taking part in this research?

We do not know if you will get any benefits by taking part in this study. This research might help us learn more about people's opinions about romantic relationships and have a better idea of what may be acceptable behavior within and following a relationship. There may be no personal benefit from your participation but the information gained by doing this research may help others in the future.

Will I be paid for taking part in this research?

We will not be able to pay you for the time you volunteer while being in this study. However if you are a current student at East Carolina University you will receive 1 research credit for participating in this study.

What will it cost me to take part in this research?

It will not cost you any money to be part of the research.

Who will know that I took part in this research and learn personal information about me?

To do this research, ECU and the people and organizations listed below may know that you took part in this research and may see information about you that is normally kept private. With your permission, these people may use your private information to do this research:

- The researcher

- Any agency of the federal, state, or local government that regulates human research. This includes the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), the North Carolina Department of Health, and the Office for Human Research Protections .
- The University & Medical Center Institutional Review Board (UMCIRB) and its staff, who have responsibility for overseeing your welfare during this research, and other ECU staff who oversee this research.

How will you keep the information you collect about me secure? How long will you keep it?

While your responses and identity will be anonymous, your information will still be kept secure. The data will be stored on a flash drive and all files pertaining to the data will be password protected. Only Ellen Ratajack and Amy Lyndon will have access to that data. After five years after publication, the data on the flash drive will be deleted.

What if I decide I do not want to continue in this research?

If you decide you no longer want to be in this research after it has already started, you may stop at any time. You will not be penalized or criticized for stopping. You will not lose any benefits that you should normally receive.

Who should I contact if I have questions?

The people conducting this study will be available to answer any questions concerning this research, now or in the future. You may contact the Principal Investigator at 219-512-3511 (business days, between 9 am – 5pm).

If you have questions about your rights as someone taking part in research, you may call the UMCIRB Office at phone number 252-744-2914 (days, 8:00 am-5:00 pm). If you would like to report a complaint or concern about this research study, you may call the Director of UMCIRB Office, at 252-744-1971.

Is there anything else I should know?

Your time and volunteer efforts are greatly appreciated. By participating in this study you are helping contribute to future research in the field of psychology.

I have decided I want to take part in this research. What should I do now?

The person obtaining informed consent will ask you to read the following and if you agree, you should sign this form:

- I have read (or had read to me) all of the above information.

- I have had an opportunity to ask questions about things in this research I did not understand and have received satisfactory answers.
- I know that I can stop taking part in this study at any time.
- By signing this informed consent form, I am not giving up any of my rights.
- I am able to print a copy of this consent document, and it is mine to keep.

Yes. I would like to participate in this study.

No. I do not want to participate in this study.

APPENDIX I: EXTENDED PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: The items below consist of a pair of contradictory characteristics-- that is, you cannot be both at the same time. The numbers form a scale between the two extremes. You are to circle the number that describes where you fall on the scale.

not at all arrogant	1 2 3 4 5	very arrogant
not at all independent	1 2 3 4 5	very independent
not at all emotional	1 2 3 4 5	very emotional
looks out for self	1 2 3 4 5	looks out for others
very passive	1 2 3 4 5	very active
not at all egotistical	1 2 3 4 5	very egotistical
difficult to devote self	1 2 3 4 5	easy to devote self
completely to others		completely to others
very rough	1 2 3 4 5	very gentle
not at all helpful to others	1 2 3 4 5	very helpful to others
not at all boastful	1 2 3 4 5	very boastful
not at all competitive	1 2 3 4 5	very competitive
not at all kind	1 2 3 4 5	very kind
not at all aware of others' feelings	1 2 3 4 5	very aware of others' feelings
can make decisions easily	1 2 3 4 5	has difficulty making decisions
not at all greedy	1 2 3 4 5	very greedy
gives up easily	1 2 3 4 5	never gives up
not at all self-confident	1 2 3 4 5	very self-confident
feels very inferior	1 2 3 4 5	feels very superior

not at all dictatorial	1 2 3 4 5	very dictatorial
not at all understanding of others	1 2 3 4 5	very understanding of others
not at all cynical	1 2 3 4 5	very cynical
very cold in relations with others	1 2 3 4 5	very warm in relations with others
not at all hostile	1 2 3 4 5	very hostile
goes to pieces under pressure	1 2 3 4 5	stands up well under pressure

APPENDIX J: STALKING MYTH SCALE

Please read each item carefully and using the scale provided indicate the degree to which you agree with the statement. For all items, one (1) means strongly disagree and six (6) means strongly agree.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

1.		People don't usually intend to harass or stalk others, but sometimes they get too carried away.
2.		Many instances of stalking by would-be-lovers could be avoided if the alleged victim would have just told his/her stalker clearly that s/he was definitely not interested in a romantic relationship.
3.		Stalking isn't really violence until the stalker has tried to commit a physical assault.
4.		People tend to exaggerate how much stalking affects them.
5.		Stalkers often suffer from serious mental illness.
6.		Many alleged stalking victims are actually people who played hard to get and "changed their minds" afterwards.
7.		No matter how a person acts, it should not be assumed that s/he led someone on to stalk him/her. ®
8.		An individual in a committed relationship has the right to keep tabs on his/her partner in whatever way s/he wants.
9.		A person never enjoys being followed or watched by another person. ®
10.		It is just part of human nature for people to pursue love interests who aren't receptive to them, after all we always want what we cannot have.

11.	Real stalking is when the stalker is a stranger.
12.	Even though someone may call it stalking, s/he probably felt flattered by all the attention.
13.	In any case where stalking is alleged, one would have to ask whether the victim was too flirtatious or sent “mixed messages.”
14.	People rarely lie about having been stalked. ®
15.	A stalker is usually someone the victim knows well. ®
16.	Being in love is not justification for stalking someone. ®
17.	Victims of stalking are primarily public figures (e.g. celebrities, politicians).
18.	Stalking doesn't really occur within a committed relationship (e.g. a marital relationship or committed homosexual couple).
19.	An individual who is willing to go to the extremes of stalking must really feel passionately for his/her love interest.
20.	Being stalked has a serious, lasting impact on the victim. ®
21.	Sometimes people will go overboard when they think they are in love, but that shouldn't be labeled “stalking.”

APPENDIX K: JUDGMENTS OF STALKING QUESTIONS

Please read each item carefully and think about the scenario that was previously displayed. For each of the following questions, choose the answer you think best describes your opinion.

1. Do you think this is a case of stalking?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Stalking	Probably Not Stalking	Possibly Not Stalking	Not Sure	Possibly Stalking	Probably Stalking	Definitely Stalking

2. How severe do you think this situation is?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Severe	Probably Not Severe	Possibly Not Severe	Not Sure	Possibly Severe	Probably Severe	Extremely Severe

3. How likely is it that Ashley will be injured in this situation?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Unlikely	Unlikely	Probably Unlikely	Not Sure	Probably Likely	Likely	Very Likely

4. How responsible is Ashley for this situation?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Responsible	Probably Not Responsible	Possibly Not Responsible	Not Sure	Possibly Responsible	Probably Responsible	Definitely Responsible

5. How responsible is Shawn for this situation?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Responsible	Probably Not Responsible	Possibly Not Responsible	Not Sure	Possibly Responsible	Probably Responsible	Definitely Responsible

6. Could Ashley have done something to lessen the seriousness of the situation?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all	Probably Not	Possibly Not	Not Sure	Possibly	Probably	Definitely

7. Could Shawn have done something to lessen the seriousness of the situation?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all	Probably Not	Possibly Not	Not Sure	Possibly	Probably	Definitely

8. Should Ashley meet with Shawn?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all	Probably Not	Possibly Not	Not Sure	Possibly	Probably	Definitely

9. Should Ashley be worried about her safety?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all	Probably Not	Possibly Not	Not Sure	Possibly	Probably	Definitely

10. To what extent can Ashley protect herself in this situation?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all	Probably Not Well	Possibly Not Well	Not Sure	Possibly Well	Probably Well	Extremely Well

11. Is a restraining order against Shawn necessary in this situation?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Necessary	Probably Not Necessary	Possibly Not Necessary	Not Sure	Possibly Necessary	Probably Necessary	Extremely Necessary

12. Should Ashley block Shawn's phone number?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all	Probably Not	Possibly Not	Not Sure	Possibly	Probably	Definitely

13. Should Ashley change her phone number?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all	Probably Not	Possibly Not	Not Sure	Possibly	Probably	Definitely

14. Should Ashley have a friend talk to Shawn about his actions?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all	Probably Not	Possibly Not	Not Sure	Possibly	Probably	Definitely

15. Should Ashley change move?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all	Probably Not	Possibly Not	Not Sure	Possibly	Probably	Definitely

16. Is police intervention necessary in this situation?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Necessary	Probably Not Necessary	Possibly Not Necessary	Not Sure	Possibly Necessary	Probably Necessary	Extremely Necessary

17. Could Shawn become violent in this situation?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all	Probably Not	Possibly Not	Not Sure	Possibly	Probably	Definitely

18. How long do you believe this situation will last?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all long	Probably Not long	Possibly Not long	Not Sure	Possibly long	Probably long	A very long time

19. Could Ashley have handled this situation better?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all	Probably Not	Possibly Not	Not Sure	Possibly	Probably	Definitely

20. Could Shawn have handled this situation better?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all	Probably Not	Possibly Not	Not Sure	Possibly	Probably	Definitely

21. To what extent was Ashley's behavior under her personal control?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all	Probably Not Much	Possibly Not Much	Not Sure	A little	Somewhat	A lot

22. To what extent was Shawn's behavior under his personal control?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all	Probably Not Much	Possibly Not Much	Not Sure	A little	Somewhat	A lot

23. To what extent were Ashley's behaviors an inevitable and uncontrollable consequence of breaking up?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all	Probably Not	Possibly Not	Not Sure	Possibly	Probably	Definitely

24. To what extent were Shawn's behaviors an inevitable and uncontrollable consequence of breaking up?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all	Probably Not	Possibly Not	Not Sure	Possibly	Probably	Definitely

25. To what extent was Ashley's behavior due to aspects of the situation she could not personally control?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All	Probably Not	Possibly Not	Not Sure	Possibly	Probably	Definitely

26. To what extent was Shawn's behavior due to aspects of the situation he could not personally control?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all	Probably Not	Possibly Not	Not Sure	Possibly	Probably	Definitely

APPENDIX L: DEBRIEFING FORM STUDY II

The goal of the study you just participated in was to examine how gender influences perceptions of stalking situations following the termination of an intimate relationship from the gender identity and gender roles of both targets and participants. By gender, I refer to one's gender identity and not biological sex (American Psychological Association, 2010; Diamond, 2000). Gender and sex are often used interchangeably, but for the purpose of this study, gender is examined as gender identity, a social and cultural mechanism, whereas the term "sex" refers to biological sex. Previous researchers have examined how sex, but not gender, may have influenced perceptions of stalking (Dennison & Thomson, 2002; Sheridan, Gillet, Davies, Blaauw, & Patel, 2003; Phillips, Quirk, Rosenfeld & O'Connor, 2004; Yanowitz, 2006; Sheridan & Scott, 2010). However, these studies have found mixed results about how sex may or may not be influential to perceptions of stalking. Examining gender may provide better clarification when examining perceptions of stalking. Gender is a result of exposure to gender expectations within the given culture (Bem, 1981).

In addition to examining gender roles, this study also examines how traditionally gendered ideas regarding stalking myths influence perceptions of stalking situations. Stalking myths are ideas about stalking that tend to place more blame on the victim and justifying the perpetrators actions. These myths include ideas like "victims are just playing hard to get and later change their minds," "stalking only takes place when the other person is a stranger" and "being in love is an acceptable excuse to stalk someone," (Sinclair, 2006). Because society views certain stalking behaviors -- such as sending letters, calling someone and sending presents -- in a positive light depending

on the context stalking myths are commonly upheld as truth. Stalking myths combined with gender roles perpetuate the acceptability of masculine men stalking feminine women.

If you find that participating in this study has made you uncomfortable or caused some distress, the phone number for the ECU Center for Counseling and Student Development is 328-6661 and is located on the second floor of the Wright Building, Room 316, <http://www.ecu.edu/studentlife/counselingcenter/>. The counseling center offers individual and group counseling, and also offers workshops on the following topics: Adjusting to College, Coping with Grief and Loss Issues, Stress Management, Assertiveness Training, Communicating and Resolving Conflict, Self-Esteem Boosters and Busters. There are also national support services, such as the National Stalking Resource Center: <http://www.ncvc.org/SRC/Main.aspx>, if you would like more information about stalking.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study or your rights as a research participant and would like to talk to someone other than the researchers, contact the Chair of the University and Medical Center Institutional Review Board at (252) 744-2914. If you have any questions about the study, please feel free to e-mail Ellen Ratajack at ratajacke09@students.ecu.edu.

APPENDIX M: SMS PERMISSION LETTER



East Carolina University

Ellen M. Ratajack, M.A. Candidate — Research Psychology Program
104 Rawl Building, East Fifth Street Greenville, N.C. 27858-4353
(E-mail): ratajacke09@students.ecu.edu

H. Colleen Sinclair, Ph.D.
Mississippi State University
Department of Psychology
110 Magruder Hall
255 Lee Blvd
Mississippi State, MS 39762
(Tel): 662-325-5108
(E-mail): csinclair@psychology.msstate.edu

Dear Dr. Sinclair,

While completing the M.A. program in Research Psychology at East Carolina University, I incorporated your Stalking Myth Scale as part of my thesis (titled, "The Influence of Gender Identity and Sex on Perceptions of Relational Stalking"). I would like your formal permission to reprint the Stalking Myth Scale in my survey:

Sinclair, H. C. (2006). Stalking myth-conceptions: Consequences of myth endorsement for the perception of stalking cases. Paper presented as part of symposium titled Advances in Research on Stalking at the American Psychology-Law Society 2006 conference in St. Petersburg, FL. (Study 1: $\alpha = .82$, $n = 103$, Study 2: $\alpha = .80$, $n = 341$).

The excerpts to be reproduced are attached to the end of this document.

The requested permission extends to any future revisions and editions of my thesis, including non-exclusive world rights in all languages, and to the prospective publication of my thesis by ProQuest Information and Learning (ProQuest) through its UMI Thesis Publishing business. Upon the electronic submission of my thesis to ProQuest, I will impose a 1 year embargo period and restricted access. During the 1 year embargo period, only the abstract and metadata of my thesis will be accessible to individuals with a valid ECU Pirate ID. After the 1 year embargo period expires, the restricted access specification will make the full contents of my thesis accessible to anyone with a valid ECU Pirate ID. ProQuest may produce and sell copies of my thesis to these individuals at that time. If you require an extension of the 1 year embargo period before its expiration, please contact me promptly before that date. I will be able to extend the embargo period by contacting both ProQuest and ECU's Joyner Library. These rights will in no way restrict republication of the material in any other form by you or by others authorized by you. Your signing of this letter will also confirm that you own the copyright to the above-described material. Your signature upon this document or permission to include your instrument within the electronic version of my thesis does not relinquish your copyright to the above-described material.

If these arrangements meet with your approval, please sign this letter where indicated below and return it to me electronically. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Ellen M. Ratajack

PERMISSION GRANTED FOR THE USE REQUESTED ABOVE:



H. Colleen Sinclair, Ph.D.

Date: 4/5/11