2015

Generation iStalk: an Examination of the prior relationship between victims of stalking and offenders

Paige Ann Heinrich
paigeheinrich1991@yahoo.com

GENERATION iSTALK: AN EXAMINATION OF THE PRIOR RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN VICTIMS OF STALKING AND OFFENDERS

A thesis submitted to
the Graduate College of
Marshall University
In partial fulfillment of
the requirement for the degree of
Master of Science
in
Criminal Justice
by
Paige Ann Heinrich

Approved by
Dr. Kimberly A. DeTardo-Bora, Committee Chair
Dr. Gordon Arthur Crews
Dr. Margaret Phipps Brown

Marshall University
May 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

Stalking is a growing issue in the United States faced by many each year. The proliferation of social media sites has made cyberstalking a new form of social harassment and potential victimization. The purpose of this study was to examine the prevalence of traditional and cyberstalking on a medium sized college campus in the Southeastern United States. Included was an examination of the impact of the victim-offender relationship, to whom victimization was reported, and gender patterns of social media use. In total, 1,040 undergraduate/graduate students were surveyed using a multistage cluster sampling method. Results showed that cyberstalking was more prevalent than traditional stalking. In addition, the most common victim-offender relationship was ex-intimate partners when the victim was cyberstalked; however, strangers were the most common victim-offender relationship for those who were traditionally stalked. Consistent with the current literature, victims were more likely to report both traditional and cyberstalking incidents to friends/family members as opposed to law enforcement. As new social networking sites continue to surface, it is imperative that they are frequently examined as therein lies the potential for cyberstalking incidents to occur.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Recent estimates show that nearly 3.3 million individuals are victims of stalking each year (Catalano, 2012). Moreover, unmarried individuals ages eighteen to nineteen (2.9%) and twenty to twenty-four (2.8%) experienced the highest prevalence of stalking victimization. National crime victimization data also reflected that the percentage of individuals who experienced stalking victimization declined with increasing age.

Stalking victims experience significant physical and emotional consequences as a result of stalking behaviors. For instance, Drebing, Bailer, Anders, Wagner, and Gallas (2014) found that two-thirds of stalking victims felt distrust toward others and were unable to rest adequately, and over half felt helpless due to their stalking victimization. Moreover, when stalking victimization occurs, in general, it affects the victim's daily routine and general sense of well-being (Logan, 2010; McNamara & Marsil, 2012; Scott, Rajakaruna & Sheridan, 2014). Interestingly, most victims do not report the stalking behavior they have experienced to law enforcement (Buhi, Clayton, & Surrency, 2009).

Given what is known about traditional stalking and cyberstalking, there are still some underlying problems with the current research and additional areas of concern. First, there is no universal legal definition of traditional stalking. While all fifty states and Congress have enacted criminal laws to address stalking, those definitions differ from jurisdiction to jurisdiction (Catalano, 2012). It is even more difficult to develop a definition for cyberstalking, since there is no clear definition of its traditional counterpart.

Second, the research needs to stay aware of victimization patterns. For example, the relationship of a previous intimate partner appears to be the most widely researched relationship (Blaauw, Winkel, Arensman, Sheridan, & Freeve, 2002; Coleman, 1997; Gover et al., 2008;

Ferreira & Matos, 2013; Logan & Walker, 2009; McEwan, MacKenzie, Mullen, & James, 2012; Sinclair, 2012).Yet, it is unclear if this paradigm holds true for victims of cyberstalking.

Third, as some studies have combined both traditional stalking and cyberstalking, it is important to examine cyberstalking independently. Here, McCormick (2014) adds "the ability to instantly connect and share with people…has begun to break down the walls of privacy control that our society had upheld for generations" (p. 3). Unless appropriate security measures are taken, personal information about an individual is easily available electronically. According to Gross (2012), "the proliferation of billions of computerized records containing information about personal, private lives means that a person with the right skills or contacts can find out virtually everything about us" (p. 7). Coupled with the fact that by the age of 25, 88.1% of individuals were using the internet and 70.6% of individuals were using smartphones (United States Census Bureau, 2012), it can be argued that technology is omnipresent. This is most troubling when it comes to defining and regulating criminal or deviant behaviors that occur through its use. Due to this the phenomena, stalking behaviors have expanded in scope and the research must be kept as current as possible.

In addition, little is known about what social media outlets are used or can be used to stalk victims. This is due to changing fads and sudden growth in social networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter. Facebook was originally created in 2004 for users with a college email address, but in 2006, Facebook began allowing non-college based users to access the social networking site (Joinson, 2008). As of December 2014, Facebook had 1.39 billion monthly active users worldwide (Facebook, 2015). However, new fads infer that Twitter is the more frequently used social networking site, even though Twitter is still smaller in comparison, with only 288 million monthly users (Twitter, Inc., 2015). While there is limited information regarding the various social media sites and their use to conduct stalking behaviors, it is assumed

that these sites are more likely to be used by younger generations since they are the targeted market.

Problem Statement

The purpose of this research was to examine the extent to which traditional stalking and cyberstalking exists among college students, and to examine the relationship between the stalking victim and the offender. Relationships measured in this research included: current intimate partners, ex-intimate partners, ex-friends, acquaintances, and strangers. These categories were modified from a study by Loftin, Kindley, Norris and Wierseman (1987). According to the authors, social relationships are difficult to conceptualize, but are significant in determining why criminal behavior occurs and how victims respond to crime. The research also examined whether stalking behaviors were conducted in a traditional or physical sense or by computer. Whether the victim reported the stalking behaviors to police, campus police, or family/friends was also examined.

Research Questions

Based on the extent literature regarding the importance of the victim-offender relationship, the current study was guided by two primary research questions in this study. They were:

1. Among traditional and cyberstalking incidents, which victim-offender relationship is more prevalent among college students (i.e., current intimate partners, ex-intimate partners, ex-friends or acquaintances, and/or strangers)?
2. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the victim-offender relationship and the victim's decision whether to report stalking behavior to the police?

Another question that was addressed is:

1. Are behaviors associated with cyberstalking more prevalent rather than behaviors associated with traditional stalking among college students?

Hypotheses

As technology continues to evolve, it may ultimately change stalking victimization patterns. Instead of the most prevalent relationship being that of an ex-intimate partner, it could now be that of ex-friends. In other words, it is the person who is no longer viewed as a "friend," rather than an ex-intimate partner, who is constantly checking social media sites to know their victim's daily activities. Given the omnipresent nature of technology it is possible that individuals fail to recognize cyberstalking behaviors. Perhaps individuals become so accustomed to the cyber behaviors that they are not reporting them to law enforcement, but instead confiding in friends and family. Furthermore, there is a social notion that females are more likely to use the social media sites in their daily activities than males.

Given the research questions, there were four main hypotheses. They are as follows:

1. The most prevalent victim-offender relationship among college students is that of ex-friends, regardless of whether cyberstalking or traditional stalking occurred.
2. Regardless of the victim-offender relationship, all victims will be less likely to report traditional or cyberstalking behaviors to law enforcement than to friends or family members.
3. Students who have been cyberstalked will be more likely to report the stalking behavior than students who have been traditionally stalked.
4. Female students will cyberstalk at a higher rate than male students.

"[S]talking is an old behavior but a new crime" (Blaauw et al., 2002, p. 50). In fact, it appears that through the use of technology, specifically social media networks, stalking has the potential to become an acceptable behavior of society if measures are not taken to control it. With the changes in technology, the research about cyberstalking needs to adapt to these changes. This research study aims to focus on these areas and shed light on not only the different types of social media are used, but the relationship between the victim and offender.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Understanding the general nature of stalking and its prevalence is limited largely due to the myriad of ways in which stalking has been defined. The lack of a consistent definition limits what is known about stalking and affects the law enforcement response to stalking behaviors. One of the main problems lies with the fact that some definitions include acts that constitute harassment but not necessarily stalking, while others include the level of fear experienced by victims. To further complicate matters, there is limited research on cyberstalking in this age of technology.

The review of existing literature highlights both traditional stalking and cyberstalking. First, there is a review of the reactions of the legal system to both traditional and cyberstalking. Second, an examination of the definitional issues associated with each type of stalking is provided. Next, information regarding the research on traditional stalking and cyberstalking is presented. The review continues with research highlights about the various prevalent victim-offender relationships. Finally, the review describes the routine activities theory (Cohen & Felson, 1979) as a theoretical basis for both traditional and cyberstalking.

Research Definitions

In the context of this research, one important question to be addressed is the definition of stalking. A related issue is whether cyberstalking and traditional stalking behaviors are the same crime or distinct offenses. Some definitions define traditional and cyberstalking to be one in the same (Alexy, Burgess, Baker, & Smoyak, 2005; Baum, Catalano, & Rand, 2009; King-Ries, 2010; Roberts, 2008), while other researchers have made clear distinctions between the two manners of stalking (Goodno, 2007; Miller, 2012; Nobles, Reyns, Fox, & Fisher, 2012; Reyns, & Englebrecht, 2012; Roberts, 2008; Simizu, 2013; Vasiu, & Vasiu, 2013).

While many researchers attempt to measure both traditional stalking and cyberstalking, the inconsistences in definitions result in drawing different conclusions about these behaviors. This is also reflected in terms of how the law is applied to these behaviors. While state or local governments look to the federal system in order to guide their legal codes the majority of the time, this is not always the case. Stalking has various definitions across the states, which will be further examined. Clearly, there is a need for a consistent way to define the phenomena of traditional stalking to adequately define the phenomena of cyberstalking.

Throughout both the traditional or cyberstalking research, stalking is a victim-centered crime. That is, recognizing stalking behaviors to be criminal depends on the victim (Campbell & Moore, 2011; Gowland, 2013). In other words, if a person does not believe or does not know that he or she is being victimized, then they are not going to report the behaviors. Furthermore, if the stalking behaviors are reported it is difficult to investigate the crime (similar to other domestic crimes). This aspect has also reflected the way the research has defined the crime of stalking, as well as the legal issues pertaining to the crime.

Traditional Stalking. Stalking in general is a relatively "new" phenomenon in the world of research. "Unlike most crimes, stalking is generally comprised of otherwise *legal* behaviors. Collectively, these behaviors are considered illegal only when a reasonable person would consider the behavior to be threatening, harassing, and frightening" (Fox, Nobles, & Akers, 2011, p. 39). Thus, researchers have used multiple definitions of stalking in their research causing some difficulties in comparing the prevalence of stalking over the years. Table 1 illustrates a sample of definitions used in various research studies. The definitions of traditional stalking shown in the table were chosen based upon several the factors: multiple researchers had used exactly the same definition in their research studies; national studies had been completed

based upon the given definition; or the definition was composed using similar components of the other definitions illustrated in the table.

Table 1

Traditional Stalking Definitions in a Sample of Research Studies: 2005-2013

Author(s)	Year	Definition
Shimizu, A.	2013	A course of conduct directed at a specific person that involves repeated visual or physical proximity, non-consensual communication, or verbal, written or implied threats, or a combination thereof, that would cause a reasonable person to fear
Growland, J.	2013	Behavior that can form a course of conduct that gives rise to alarm or distress
Miller, L.	2012	Intentional pattern of repeated intrusive and intimidating behaviors toward a specific person that causes the target to feel harassed, threatened, and fearful, or that a reasonable person would regard as being so
Storey, J. E., & Hart, S.D.	2011	Unwanted and repeated communication, contact, or other contact that deliberately or recklessly causes people to experience reasonable fear or concern for their safety or the safety of others known to them
Reyns, B. W., & Englebrecht, C. M.	2010	Repeatedly being pursued in a manner that causes a reasonable person to fear for his or her safety
*Baum, K., Catalano, S., Rand, M., Rose, K.	2009	Making unwanted phone calls, sending unsolicited or unwanted letters or emails, following or spying on the victim, showing up at places for the victim, leaving unwanted items, presents, or flowers, posting information or spreading rumors about the victim on the internet, in a public place, or by word of mouth
**Tjaden, P. G.	2009	Repeatedly maintaining a visual or physical proximity to a person, repeatedly conveying verbal or written threats or threats implied by conduct or combination thereof directed at or toward a person…(repeated meaning on two or more occasions)
Roberts, L.	2008	Repeated unwanted intrusive behaviors that result in the victim experiencing fear, physical or psychological harm or emotional distress
Goodno, N. H.	2007	Repeated harassing or threatening behavior
Basile, K. C., Swahn, M. H., Chen, J., & Saltzman, L. E.	2006	Being followed, spied on, or communicated with, without consent at a level perceived to be somewhat dangerous or life threatening
Alexy, E. M., Burgess, A. W., Baker, T., & Smoyak, S. A.	2005	Direct or indirect acts, such as following a person, appearing at a person's home or place of business, making harassing phone calls, leaving written messages or objects, or vandalizing a person's property

*Definition used for the National Crime Victimization Survey, **Definition used for *Modeling Stalking Code*: National Criminal Justice Association (1993)

While there are differences among the definitions of stalking, there are similarities as shown in Table 1. First, stalking consists of repeated acts or behaviors (Goodno, 2007; Miller, 2012; Reyns & Englebrecht, 2010; Roberts, 2008; Shimizu, 2013; Storey & Hart, 2011; Tjaden, 2009). The repeated behaviors that comprise stalking distinguishes stalking from harassment. While harassment is considered an element of stalking, the two should not be used interchangeably. Researchers who used the terms interchangeably or who blur the definitions may not be obtaining the true prevalence of either act.

Second, five definitions cited in Table 1 include the element of unwanted or nonconsensual behaviors by the stalker (Baum et al., 2009; Basile, Shahn, Chen, & Saltzman, 2006; Roberts, 2008; Shimizu, 2013; Storey & Hart, 2011). In fact, various research studies concentrate strictly on the idea of unwanted pursuit. Unwanted pursuit, in itself, however, does not constitute stalking. Research demonstrates that there is a difference between the act of criminal stalking and acts of simply unwanted pursuit (De Smet, Loeys, & Buysse, 2012; Dutton & Winstead, 2011; Williams & Frieze, 2005).

Third, fear, alarm, distress, or life threatening are used interchangeably to describe the victim reaction to stalking (Basile et al., 2006; Gowland, 2013; Miller, 2012; Reyns & Englebrecht, 2010; Roberts, 2008; Shimizu, 2013; Storey & Hart, 2011). These reactions are measured objectively, from the perspective of a reasonable person. Subjective fear is complex and abstract in nature; however, stalking statutes consistently refer to the objective, or reasonable person, standard in defining the victim's reaction to stalking.

A few other characteristics of the definitions contained in Table 1 merit attention. For example, Shimizu (2013) and Tajden (2009) refer to the stalker maintaining visual or physical proximity. Alexy et al. (2005) refer instead to direct or indirect acts. Shimizu (2013) and Tajden (2009) incorporate implied threats into their respective definitions. The concept of implied

threats considers the intent behind the threats. It is difficult to determine whether or not there was truly malicious intent behind the implied threat, in some cases. Also, it is difficult to determine whether or not a reasonable person would perceive the implied threat to be threatening at all.

Differences among the researchers' definitions of traditional stalking are illustrated in Table 1 as well. For example, Alexy et al.'s (2005) definition includes vandalizing the victim's property, yet this element does not appear in any of the other definitions in the sample. Because vandalizing another's property is a separate crime from stalking in most jurisdictions, this concept could be outdated today. Similarly, the definition adopted by Storey and Hart (2011) provides that victims may fear for their own safety or for the safety of others known to them. This factor may be significant in cases where a victim is being stalked by a current or former intimate partner who is threatening the victim's children or other loved ones.

Another significant difference is contained in Baum et al.'s (2009) definition. The authors include stalking by email or over the Internet. This indicates the authors' intent to group traditional stalking with cyberstalking. The National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) employs this definition of stalking. Other researchers rely on the NCVS data to test and/or support their own research (King-Ries, 2010; Ngo & Paternoster, 2013; Reyns & Englebrecht, 2012).

It is important to note that the list of studies and definitions of stalking contained in Table 1 is neither comprehensive nor exclusive. The list does, however, represent variations in the definitions of stalking employed by researchers and the lack of a consensus definition. Due to the fact that researchers have used variations of the definitions contained in Table 1 (Duntley & Buss, 2012; Fox, et al., 2011; Nobles & Fox, 2013; Nobles et al., 2012), research studies have

produced different results. To consistently measure, test, investigate, prosecute, and/or compare rates of stalking, a universal definition must to be developed and adopted.

Cyberstalking. In comparison to traditional stalking, cyberstalking has been defined and even stated (i.e., online stalking, cyber stalking) in a variety of ways. Thus, researchers have not conceptualized and operationalized cyberstalking in a uniform manner across research studies. Since varying definitions have been used it is hard to compare the prevalence of cyberstalking over the years. However, Table 2 illustrates a sample of studies with cyberstalking definitions that have been used in various research studies. The definitions of cyberstalking shown in Table 2 were chosen for one of two reasons: (1) multiple researchers have either used exactly the same definition of cyberstalking in their research studies or (2) researchers have used a slight variation of the definitions.

Table 2

Cyberstalking Definitions from a Sample of Research Studies: 2007-2013

Author(s)	Year	Definition
National Conference of State Legislators	2013	The use of the Internet, email or other electronic communications to stalk, and generally refers to a pattern of threatening or malicious behaviors
National White Collar Crime Center	2013	[repeatedly] sending threats or false accusations via email or mobile phone, making threatening or false posts on websites, stealing a person's identity or data or spying and monitoring a person's computer and Internet use
Vasiu, I., & Vasiu, L.	2013	Group of behaviors in which an individual, group of individuals or organization uses information and communication technologies to harass one or more individuals; such behavior may include, without being limited to, the transmission of threats and false accusations, identity theft, damage to data or equipment, computer monitoring and the solicitation of minors for sexual purposes
Shimizu, A.	2013	Includes the use of the Internet, e-mail, and other electronic communication devices to stalk another person. This includes sending threatening or obscene e-mail, spamming, harassing in chat rooms, tracing another person's computer and Internet activity, and posting threatening or harassing messages on blogs or through social media
Reyns, B. W., Henson, B., & Fisher, B. S.	2012	Repeated pursuit of an individual using electronic or Internet-capable devices…repeated pursuit behaviors include persistent and unwanted electronic communications that can contain messages laced with coercive or intimidating wording or sexual overtones. The repeated communications often transpire via e-mails, blogs, instant messenger messages, text or video messages, chat rooms, on-line social networks, or other websites
Reyns, B. W., Henson, B., & Fisher, B. S.	2011	Repeated pursuit of an individual using electronic or Internet-capable devices…harassment or threats via e-mail, instant messenger, chat rooms, message or bulletin boards, or other Internet sites…use [of] electronic devices to monitor their victims, such as cameras, listening devices, computer programs, and Global Positioning System
Thapa, A., & Kumar, R.	2011	The use of information technology in order to harass one or more victims…incorporates persistent behaviors that instill apprehension and fear…include[s] such acts as stock market fraud, identity theft, sexual harassment, data theft, impersonation, consumer fraud, computer monitoring, and attacks by political groups on government services
Sheridan, L. P., & Grant, T.	2007	Seeking and compiling information on the victim in order to harass, threaten and intimidate the victim online or off-line; repeated unsolicited e-mailing and Instant Messaging; electronic sabotage such as spamming and sending viruses to the target; identity theft; subscribing the victim to services; purchasing goods and services in the victim's name; impersonating another online; sending or posting hostile material, misinformation and false messages (e.g. to Usenet groups); and, tricking other Internet users into harassing or threatening a victim

The most widely agreed upon concept of cyberstalking among the studies in Table 2 is that the acts occur via the Internet or electronic devices (National Conference of State Legislators, 2013; National White Collar Crime Center, 2013; Reyns, Henson, & Fisher, 2012; Reyns, Henson, & Fisher, 2011; Sheridan & Grant, 2007; Shimizu, 2013; Thapa & Kumar, 2011; Vasiu & Vasiu, 2013). This makes sense given that the behavior is "cyber" in nature. However, the use of other electronic devices can be a vague dimension. For instance, King-Ries' (2010) study suggests that cyberstalking can occur through text messages. This new technology is one that was not specifically considered to be a tool in cyberstalking and should be included in future definitions.

A second concept that appeared in six of the eight studies, and is similar to traditional stalking definitions, is that the acts or behaviors occurred repeatedly or persistently (NCSL, 2013; NW3C, 2013; Reyns et al., 2012; Reyns at al., 2011; Thapa & Kumar, 2011; Vasiu & Vasiu, 2013). This, like traditional stalking, is critical in determining if the acts truly constitute cyberstalking. The use of the word harassing or harass, as with traditional stalking, is included in many cyberstalking definitions. Again, there should be a clear distinction between what constitutes an act of stalking and what constitutes an act of harassment as the two appear to be used interchangeably throughout the literature (Reyns et al., 2011; Sheridan & Grant, 2007; Thapa & Kumar, 2011; Vasiu & Vasiu, 2013). While all stalking does involve harassment, not all harassment involves stalking.

A concept that is unique to cyberstalking, in comparison to traditional stalking, is the use of technology to monitor the victim, as shown in Table 2 (NW3C, 2013; Sheridan & Grant, 2007; Shimizu, 2013; Vasiu & Vasiu, 2013). This concept of monitoring can include, but is not limited to, the use of cameras, listening devices, computer programs, and Global Positioning Systems (GPS) (Reyns et al., 2011). These advancements in technology may not have been

originally created with the intent of such uses. Hence, it is difficult to justifiably limit the use of them. Moreover, it is difficult to determine an individual's intention when using these functions on an electronic device.

Four of the eight researchers shown in Table 2 included identity theft in their definitions of cyberstalking (NW3C, 2013; Sheridan & Grant, 2007; Thapa & Kumar, 2011; Vasiu & Vasiu, 2013). According to the National White Collar Crime Center, the reason why identity theft is an element of cyberstalking is due to the intent behind the act. Identity thieves have the goal of financial gain while cyberstalkers want to simply harm or annoy the person (NW3C, 2013). Along the same lines is the concept of impersonating the victim in an online environment (Sheridan & Grant, 2007; Thapa & Kumar, 2011). Although impersonation may be associated with identity theft, in some studies it is defined separately depending upon the intent.

Data theft or data damage is used in three of the eight researchers' definitions of cyberstalking (NW3C, 2013; Thapa & Kumar, 2011; Vasiu & Vasiu, 2013) (see Table 2). Similar to harassment and identity theft, this concept is not unique to the definition of cyberstalking. Instead, data theft or damage can be classified as an element of cyberstalking when the intent is to intimidate or harass the victim.

Along with similarities, Table 2 displays differences among the eight definitions. One of these differences is illustrated by Sheridan and Grant (2007), where the concept of tricking other Internet users into harassing or threatening the victim was examined as a method of cyberstalking. However, this concept was not used in other more recent studies. It is possible that this portion of the definition became dated or become irrelevant to the behavior of cyberstalking.

Another unique concept in the definition of cyberstalking used by Thapa and Kumar (2011) was that of attacks by political groups on government services (see Table 2). A reason as to why this may not have been used in other studies could be due to the fact that this blurs the

line between crimes that may not be stalking related, (i.e., cyber terrorism or cyber warfare). Similarly, crimes such as cyber child pornography might be blurred with cyberstalking if one were to use the concept of solicitation of minors for sexual purposes as Vasiu and Vasiu (2013) used in their definition of cyberstalking.

Sheridan and Grant (2007) and Baum et al. (2009) treated traditional stalking and cyberstalking to be one in the same when they stated that the acts could be done for online or offline harassment, threatening, or intimidating purposes (see Table 2). The idea of defining the crimes of traditional and cyberstalking to be one in the same is one that will be examined further in this review.

Legal Reactions to Traditional and Cyberstalking

Traditional Stalking. In the United States, stalking was first recognized as a crime by the state of California in 1990 (Miller, 2012; Nobles & Fox, 2013; Nobles et al., 2012; Tjaden, 2009). The catalyst for this first statute was the death of actress Rebecca Shaeffer at the hands of an obsessed fan, who had stalked her prior to her murder (Coleman, 1997; Nobles & Fox, 2013; Tjaden, 2009).

Congress enacted a federal stalking statute in 1996. That statute defined stalking as traveling within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States with the intent to kill, injure, harass or place under surveillance, or cause substantial emotional distress or in reasonable fear of death of, or serious bodily injury to the victim (18 U.S.C. §2261A). The Federal Telephone Harassment Statue also addresses stalking (47 U.S.C. §223). The Federal Telephone Harassment Statue addresses obscene or harassing telephone calls in the District of Columbia or in interstate or foreign communications. It pertains to stalking when stalking behaviors include placing repeated telephone calls or repeatedly initiating communication using a telecommunications device for the sole purpose of harassing another individual.

Aside from the federal statue, there are stalking statues for all of the fifty states, the District of Columbia, tribal lands, and federal lands (National Center for Victims of Crime). While the state statues are generally similar, there are some differences in the ways certain elements of stalking are defined. Elements that can vary from state to state include the intent (general or specific), the level of fear, proof of threat, target of the actions, and the classification of the crime (aggravated or non-aggravated) (National Center for Victims of Crime). For example, the Ohio crime of stalking addresses the fear element both subjectively and objectively. Stalking occurs when a victim experiences (subjective) fear or when a reasonable person experiences fear (objective). Under the Ohio crime of menacing by stalking, the victim must experience (subjective) "mental distress" (Ohio Revised State Code, §2903.211). This is defined as any mental illness or condition that causes some temporary substantial incapacity, or would normally require mental health services. West Virginia's statute, in comparison, employs an objective standard to assess the fear element. West Virginia Code § 61-2-9a, defines "harasses," as actions that would cause a reasonable person mental injury or emotional distress, an objective standard.

Aggravated stalking is also defined by statute in several states. Aggravated stalking pertains to the act of stalking in conjunction with other offenses (National Center for Victims of Crime). For example, in Georgia under § 16-5-91, aggravated stalking is defined as committing the offense of stalking in violation of a protection or restraining order. According to the National Center for Victims of Crime, ten states have addressed aggravated stalking in a specific statute in manner similar to Georgia (Alabama, Hawaii, Illinois, Michigan, New Mexico, Ohio, Oregon, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Vermont), and five states have addressed stalking in tiers or degrees (Alaska, Connecticut, Idaho, Kentucky, and New York). Stalking could have been

addressed in a tier system if there were different levels of stalking defined within the same statute.

There are issues that arise when prosecuting the offense of stalking, one of which is double jeopardy. An example of this can be seen in *New Mexico v. Richart* (2011). In this case the defendant was convicted of stalking, aggravated stalking, harassment, and criminal trespass. The defendant argued that his convictions constituted a violation of the Double Jeopardy clause of the United States Constitution. Upon appeal, the Court of Appeals of New Mexico held that the defendant had properly been convicted of stalking and aggravated stalking because separate facts satisfied the elements of each charge. However, in a similar case (*New Mexico v. Smile,* 2010) the Court of Appeals of New Mexico was found that a pattern of aggravated stalking was not necessary to prove aggravated stalking. Aggravated stalking could be charged as an escalation of the crime of stalking as soon as one of the aggravating factors occurs. An example of an aggravating factor would be to continue stalking or harassing the victim after a protection order is in place.

While there are federal and state statues in place that address stalking, it should be noted that there is a need for education pertaining to what constitutes stalking, especially among those in charge of enforcing the statutes. In fact, "nearly ten years after stalking laws were enacted nationwide . . . many criminal justice professionals and policymakers gave incorrect answers when asked to provide a legal definition of stalking" (Tjaden, 2009, p. 263).

Cyberstalking. Under the Federal Stalking Statue, cyberstalking can arguably be addressed when the phrase "any interactive computer service" is used to describe a method of stalking. There are three ways in which cyberstalking is addressed among the states: through a completely new statue, through an amendment to existing stalking statute(s), or not at all. Thirty-seven states have enacted statutes that address cyberstalking (National Conference of State

Legislators, 2015) in some way. Of those thirty-seven, six states have enacted cyberstalking statutes to address the specific methods in which cyberstalking can occur and should be penalized (Illinois, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Rhode Island, and Washington) (National Center for Victims of Crime). An example of this can be seen in Illinois cyberstalking statute: "(a) a person commits cyberstalking when he or she engages in a course of conduct using electronic communication directed at a specific person…" 720 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 5/12-7.5 (LexisNexis, 2014).

States that have amended an existing stalking statue to address cyberstalking typically add language from the federal statute. For example, in the Ohio Revised Code, menacing by stalking can occur through the use of any electronic method of remotely transferring information… (ORC Ann. 2903.211 LexisNexis, 2014). Another example is Kentucky's Revised State Statute that defines stalking to include the "use of equipment, instrument, machine, or other device…including computer, Internet or other electronic network…" (Ky. Rev. Stat. Ann. §508.130 LexisNexis, 2014).

While there are thirty-seven states that address cyberstalking, cyberspace in and of itself is a complicated issue for legislators to address as there are various interpretations of the word "cyberspace". There are some researchers who assert that cyberspace is an extension of the "real world," whereas others assert cyberspace is a distant "place" with significant borders separating it from the "real world" (Basu & Jones, 2007). However cyberspace is defined, the existence of cyberspace offers a new perception of anonymity to offenders. The perception of anonymity adds a new dimension to the concept of stalking (Basu & Jones, 2007; Shimizu, 2013; Vasiu & Vasiu, 2013).

The right to free speech is guaranteed by the First Amendment and includes the right to anonymous speech (Shimizu, 2013). While it is difficult to propose laws or acts that may

infringe upon an individual's right to free speech, there is an exception when the speech would constitute a true threat. A true threat is a threat that can be verbal, written, implied through a pattern of conduct or a combination of the methods (National Center for Victims of Crime). Since the First Amendment does not protect obscene or offensive language, laws that prohibit true threats, whether they are delivered anonymously or not, do not violate the First Amendment.

An example of how the First Amendment is addressed can be seen in the court case, *United States v. Cassidy* (2011). In this case, the defendant was prosecuted for posting negative messages on a blog and onto a Twitter page about a group, and about a specific individual. The District Court of Maryland held that the defendant's actions were protected by his First Amendment right to free speech because the defendant's speech did not fall into the any of the unprotected categories; obscenity, fraud, defamation, true threat, incitement, or speech integral to criminal conduct. The Court pointed out that the plaintiff in the case had the ability to ignore or block the messages/tweets. The court distinguished online posts from telephone calls, stating that telephone calls are directed at specific individuals, while online posts may not be.

In a similar case, *New Hampshire v. Craig* (2014), the Supreme Court of New Hampshire ruled that the posting of blogs and messages did constitute stalking. However, evidence that the offender had directly and deliberately directed the victim's attention to the posts was found. This evidence could distinguish the *Craig* case from *Cassidy*. It should also be noted that the rulings were based upon different statutes, which could account for the disparity in decisions.

If specific stalking statutes are not created to address the areas in which technology could enhance crimes or be the means by which crimes are conducted, then the statutes must at least remain broad to be relevant in a changing society. The process of creating legislation that is broad enough to consideration the advances in technology, but not so broad that it creates unconstitutional statutes is difficult, especially in this 21st century society.

Harassment as an Element of Stalking

In exploring the definitions of both traditional stalking and cyberstalking it has become apparent that there is a need for a clear separation between the crime of stalking and its element of harassment. The two concepts appear to be used interchangeably, even in the law (Gowland, 2013; Harvey, 2003; Salter & Bryden, 2009). However, some policy makers and researchers are beginning to see the importance of defining the two separately and are working to do so (Lipton, 2011; Shimuz, 2013). Harassment is an element of the crime of stalking. When the harassing acts become repetitive, the crime of stalking has occurred (Goodno, 2007; Miller, 2012; Reyns & Englebrecht, 2010; Roberts, 2008; Shimizu, 2013; Storey & Hart, 2011; Tjaden, 2009).

Fear as an Element of Stalking

As stated earlier, fear, alarm, or distress are all concepts that were used interchangeably to describe how the victim should perceive stalking (Basile et al., 2006; Gowland, 2013; Miller, 2012; Reyns & Englebrecht, 2010; Roberts, 2008 Shimizu, 2013; Storey & Hart, 2011). As shown earlier in Table 1, fear is a concept that is widely agreed upon as a concept vital to determine if a series of incidents were in fact traditional stalking. Again, from a legal standpoint, without a level of fear in the victim then no crime has occurred (Tjaden, 2009).

Fear is a complex concept. Researchers have not found a way in which to conceptualize it, leading to inconsistencies in both traditional and cyberstalking research (Reyns & Englebrecht, 2012). Even if fear is conceptualized, the issue with it being associated with both traditional stalking and cyberstalking research arises when stalking victims have not recognized that they are being stalked (Campbell & Moore, 2011; Duntley & Buss, 2012). In addition, some stalking victims do not necessarily feel fear. Instead, the victims may have interpreted the incidents as annoying or unwanted (Campbell & Moore, 2011; Duntely & Buss, 2012; Reyns & Englebrecht, 2010).

The concept of fear is critical in determining whether the acts constitute criminal stalking. If fear is not present, but instead the victim is simply annoyed or irritated by the behaviors, then the act may be considered "unwanted pursuit" (Dutton & Winstead, 2011). Where the line is crossed from unwanted pursuit to stalking is a hazy one, however (Williams & Frieze, 2005). Fear is a subjective concept, but stalking definitions often view fear objectively.

The distinction between fear and the concept of unwanted pursuit becomes a large factor when examining social networking sites and being pursued by a previous or current intimate partner. Social networking sites open a new realm of opportunity in terms of access to an individual's personal information. Individuals are able to use applications to broadcast their daily activities to others with or without the knowledge of who is actually able to see such posts, unless the proper privacy settings are used.

It appears that when individuals are pursued by previous or current intimate partners the acts are interpreted by victims as unwanted pursuit instead of stalking (De Smet, et al., 2012; Dutton & Winstead, 2001; Sinclair, 2012; Williams & Frieze, 2005). This is where the concept of "creeping" can enter. This concept is not necessarily one with malicious intent, or the intent to cause fear, distress, or alarm, but instead the concept of "creeping" can be viewed as simply checking up on another person, or viewing one's profile or pictures. However, it is difficult to say with certainty what constitutes harmless "creeping" and when does "creeping" cross into cyberstalking. The two dimensions of social networking sites and being pursued by a previous or current intimate partner are ones that will be further examined in this review.

Are Traditional Stalking and Cyberstalking Two Completely Different Crimes?

As a result of the differences shown in Tables 1 and 2, there is a lingering question among the different research studies, as to whether cyberstalking is simply an extension of traditional stalking or a new and separate crime all. It appears that while there are several

research studies that address this question, there is still an ongoing debate (Basu & Jones, 2007; Goodno, 2007; Miller, 2012; Nobles & Fox, 2013; Nobles et al., 2012; Reyns & Englebrecht, 2012; Reyns et al., 2012; Roberts, 2008; Sheridan & Grant, 2007; Shimizu, 2013).

Some of the early 2000 research suggests that cyberstalking is just another way for stalkers to pursue their victims (Basu & Jones, 2007; Roberts, 2008; Sheridan & Grant, 2007).

> Cyberstalking represents an old crime modified to take advantage of the electronic environment. Over time as Internet use is 'normalized' there are likely to be less distinctions made between stalking and cyberstalking. While some stalkers will exclusively use offline or online methods of stalking, the majority are likely to use elements of both. (Basu & Jones, 2007, p. 277)

As the research progressed over the years, it appears that traditional stalking and cyberstalking were simply understood to be the same. The focus then shifted from how an individual pursued another person to why an individual pursued another. This shift can be seen in the various research studies completed on ex-intimate partners (De Smet et al., 2012; Dutton & Winstead, 2011; Ménard & Pincus, 2012; Weller, Hope, & Sheridan, 2013) and current intimate partners (Gover, Kaukinen, & Fox, 2008; Scott, Rajakaruna, & Sheridan, 2014; Theriot, 2008; Towns & Scott, 2013).

While the trend among researchers was that traditional and cyberstalking were conceptually the same, as previously mentioned, this is not always the case. Two of the researchers have suggested that the traditional and cyberstalking are not one in the same and should be viewed as two independent crimes (Goodno, 2007; Shimizu, 2013). There are five main reasons as to why Goodno (2007) states traditional and cyberstalking are different.

> cyberstalkers use the Internet to instantly harass their victims with wide dissemination…cyberstalkers can be physically far removed from their victim…cyberstalkers can remain nearly anonymous…cyberstalkers can easily impersonate their victims… [and] cyberstalkers can encourage 'innocent' third-party harassment. (Goodno, 2007, pp.128-132)

Viewing traditional and cyberstalking as different acts means that they should be prosecuted and investigated differently and that completely new laws should be in place to address cyberstalking (Goodno, 2007; Shimizu, 2013).

Recent research has refuted the idea that traditional and cyberstalking are completely independent of one another (Reyns & Englebrecht, 2012; Reyns et al., 2012). It has been stated that while there are isolated events of purely traditional stalking and purely cyberstalking, the two can converge (Reyns et al., 2012). While it appears that most recent researchers have concluded that cyberstalking is simply an extension of traditional stalking, (Miller, 2012; Nobles & Fox, 2013; Nobles et al., 2012; Reyns & Englebrecht, 2012; Reyns et al., 2012) there are still some researchers who have concluded that the two concepts are different from one another and should therefore be addressed differently (Shimizu, 2013).

The limitation across the research studies boils down to the inconsistencies of definitions, and with this in mind, it is difficult to compare research over the years due to the various ways in which traditional stalking and cyberstalking has been defined. With the advances in technology and the increased use of such technology, for example, the number of cellphone subscribers from the years of 1990 to 2010 increased about fifty-seven times (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). It is difficult to separate the use of technology from our daily lives.

Traditional Stalking Research

There are several reoccurring themes within the stalking research. The first theme pertains to the different typologies of stalkers. The second theme is that research is predominately conducted with college students (Björklund, Häkkänen-Nyholm, Sheridan, & Roberts, 2010; Buhi, Clayton, & Surrency, 2008; Gover, et al., 2008; Jordan, Wilcox, & Pritchard, 2007; McNamara & Marsil, 2012; Williams & Frieze, 2005), while fewer research studies use adolescent populations (Theriot, 2008; Vaidya, Chalhoub, & Newing, 2005). A third reoccurring theme is the link between domestic violence and stalking, in which the stalker is either a current or an ex-intimate partner (Blaauw et al., 2002; Coleman, 1997; Gover et al., 2008; Ferreira & Matos, 2013; Logan & Walker, 2009; McEwan et al., 2012; Sinclair, 2012). The fourth theme pertains to law enforcement (Campbell & Moore, 2011; Reyns & Englebrecht, 2012; Roberts, 2008; Shimizu, 2013; Storey & Hart, 2011; Tjaden, 2009). Unwanted pursuit is another theme that has been more recently examined in terms of stalking (De Smet et al., 2012; Dutton & Winstead, 2011; Sinclar, 2012).

First, traditional stalking research has identified different typologies of stalkers. In 1989, through cooperation with Los Angeles Police Department, Dr. Michael Zona, Dr. Kaushal Sharma, and Lieutenant John Lane were able to conduct in-depth interviews with seventy-four subjects who had engaged in stalking behavior (Wallace & Roberson, 2014). It was through these interviews that three different stalker typologies were created, erotonmania, love obsessional, and simple obessional. Zona and colleagues (1993) described erotomania as a stalker with a delusional disorder. These stalkers were associated with being obsessed with an individual in higher status than themselves (i.e. public figure). Love Obsessional, the second typology, described as being similar to that of erotomania, but these stalkers typically engage in trying to contact the victim through telephone calls or letters. The third typology, Simple

Obsessional, was as being different from the first two in that the victim knows the stalker in some way (i.e., previous relationship, employer, etc.). Zona et al. (1993) also identified the false victimization syndrome. This was described as an individual who desired to be in the victim role and would insist that someone was stalking them.

Another set of stalking typologies was created through RECON or relationship and context-based stalking (Mohandie, Meloy, McGown, & Williams, 2006). RECON focused upon the pursuit patterns of stalking, and further broke down the typologies created by Zona et al. (1993). Mohandie et al. (2006) divided the reasons behind stalking into two categories, which then were divided into four typologies. The first type of stalkers had previous relationships (private figure context), and was broken down into intimate (i.e., marriage, dating, sexual relationship) and acquaintance (non-intimate relationships) context. Second, was that of no prior contact in the context of a public figure and a private figure (a victim that does not know the stalker; but had been identified by the stalker in some way.) The use of typologies serves to help us understand the reasoning behind stalking behavior, but not necessarily how the behavior occurs.

The second theme, that more research is completed with college student populations should not be a surprising one. Overall, college campuses create a more convenient way to survey a large sample. In addition, it appears that stalking and other forms of violence are of particular concern among college campuses (Buhi et al., 2008). Collectively, 21% of stalking occurs among college students, according to McNamara and Marsil (2012). However, other researchers have concluded that college stalking can range from 6% to 27% (Jordan et al., 2007). According to Logan (2010), the rate at which college women experience rates of stalking is about 5.3%, and about 6.9% of college women were stalked by a current or ex-intimate partner. Similarly to others, this study concluded that various amounts of stalking rates were reported. It

appears that the rates can vary due to the inconsistent ways in which stalking is defined, sample size, sample demographic, and the measurement used (Björklund et al., 2010; Jordan et al., 2007).

Third, when examining victim-offender relationships more college students have expressed that the stalking by a stranger is more dangerous (Cass & Rosay, 2012). However, consistently research studies have examined the link between domestic violence and stalking (Buhi et al., 2008; Jordan et al., 2007; McNamara & Marsil, 2012; Scott et al., 2014). When looking at the victim-offender relationship, the victim is less likely to seek help in handling the situation if the offender is an ex-intimate partner (Buhi et al., 2008; Jordan et al., 2007; McNamara & Marsil, 2012; Scott et al., 2014). Perhaps victims of ex-intimate partner stalking believe that they can handle the situation themselves, or perhaps it is related to the victim perception that this relationship is not as serious to law enforcement in comparison other victim-offender relationships, such as a stranger (Cass & Rosay, 2012; Scott, Rajakaruna, & Sheridan, 2014; Weller et al., 2013).

The fourth reoccurring theme pertaining to law enforcement can be broken into two categories. These are (1) in relation to police reactions, in general, and (2) the need for training on how to investigate stalking cases (Campbell & Moore, 2011; Cass & Rosay, 2012; Reyns & Englebrecht, 2012; Roberts, 2008; Shimizu, 2013; Storey & Hart, 2011; Tjaden, 2009).

Cass and Rosay (2012) examined the perception of how the criminal justice system responds to stalking. This was completed by asking a sample of both female and male undergraduate students (n = 513) to complete a survey. Each survey contained two scenarios and asked students how seriously the criminal justice system would perceive the scenarios. Results indicated that college students believed that the criminal justice system would be more likely to take the stalking situation seriously if the victim-offender relationship was heterosexual. There

was also a common belief among both male and female participants that the system would take the stranger stalking more seriously than that of the ex-intimate partner stalking. This is an interesting finding, considering that most of the research shows that an ex-intimate partner is the most prevalent relationship (De Smet et al., 2012; Dutton & Winstead, 2011; Ferreira & Matos, 2013; Scott et al., 2014; Williams & Frieze, 2005).

It is common knowledge within the criminal justice field that majority of crimes are not reported to police. However, "[e]ven with police involvement it took an average of almost six months to end the stalking behaviors" (Storey & Hart, 2011, p. 139). This supports Campbell and Moore's (2011) idea that education of law enforcement on how to handle stalking incidents is vital and can be aided through further research of stalking in general.

A fifth theme was that of unwanted pursuit defined as behaviors that are similar to stalking, but may not "cross the line" (De Smet et al., 2012; Dutton & Winstead, 2011; Sinclar, 2012). Unwanted pursuit behaviors are perceived to be annoying, infringing upon a victim's privacy, or upsetting to a victim; however, when these behaviors cause fear to the victim, they are legally no longer unwanted pursuit behaviors but stalking behaviors (De Smet, et al., 2012). In a research study completed by Dutton and Winstead (2011) avoidance tactics were the most important tool to end the unwanted pursuit.

Definitions and measurements of unwanted pursuit in the research studies (De Smet et al., 2012; Dutton & Winstead, 2011; Sinclar, 2012) did not differentiate between the concepts of traditional stalking and cyberstalking, as with other research studies previously highlighted here. Hence, the most recent stalking research does not separate the means of how stalking is completed. Instead, the studies simply observe that stalking can be completed in both traditional and cyber manners within the same situation.

Cyberstalking Research

Similar to traditional stalking, cyberstalking research has developed several themes. The three most significant themes are of domestic violence, social media networking sites, and law enforcement. There have been different studies that have focused on these different aspects of cyberstalking. However, as stated before "there are relatively few statistics available regarding cyberstalking" (NW3C, 2013, p. 1). This is due to the definitional issues as addressed before and of course, similar to traditional stalking, the apparent "newness" of this phenomenon. Another reason few statistics could be available for cyberstalking is due to researchers not differentiating between traditional and cyberstalking, as stated earlier.

While there are limited statistics on cyberstalking, the group WHOA (Working to Halt Online Abuse) have been collecting data about online abuse since 2000. According to WHOA data in 2012, 83% of cyberstalking instances escalated; however, in 2013 this percentage decreased to 76%. Escalation was defined as moving from harmless messages to increasing more direct and threatening messages. The top three ways in which escalation occurred were consistently through Facebook (22%, in 2012; 29% in 2013), by phone (17% in 2012; 25% in 2013) and by text message (11% in 2012; 24% in 2013) (WHOA, 2012; WHOA, 2013). These statistics illustrate the large impact of technology on the 21st century's society through the increase of the top escalation methods. However, this research study is limited. The statistics reflected are from voluntary online surveys that the participants must seek out or be referred to. Random sampling methods are not used in the data collection process nor is there a sampling frame from which to sample the elements.

In another research study, Alexy and colleges (2005) gained insight on the different generations of cyberstalking. The article concluded that younger generations are experiencing a higher occurrence of cyberstalking (Alexy et al., 2005). The latest results of WHOA (2013)

support this finding. WHOA found that 38% of cyberstalking victims were between the ages of 18-30. This is an increase in comparison to WHOA's 2012 results which indicated that the victims between the ages of 31-40 experienced a higher rate of cyberstalking compared to those ages of 18-30, 38% and 36% respectively (WHOA, 2012).

King-Ries (2010) found an increased use of technology by teens and how it has impacted their dating lives, as well as their lives in general. The author made a clear connection between stalking and domestic violence. The study illustrated the seriousness of certain "accepted" behaviors, especially the idea of no boundaries between intimate partners, even those still in their teens. To add to this, Basu and Jones (2007) concluded that "Internet users should tolerate some stalking as users choose to enter cyberspace" (Basu & Jones, 2007, p. 21). This concept is reflective of the "no boundaries" attitude discussed in King-Ries (2010).

One aspect of cyberstalking that was mentioned throughout King-Ries' (2010) study, but is not mentioned as much in other studies is the idea of stalking via text. Stalking via text can be done by constantly checking up on a person or the use of text messaging to send threatening messages according to King-Ries (2010). It appears that the issue of cyberstalking is having a large impact on the younger generation as technological advantages become the norm.

In more recent studies, the impact of social media has been discussed. Facebook is seen to be the most common social network site. Program like Facebook facilitate stalking behaviors more easily than in the past (Chaulk & Jones, 2011; Lenhart, Purcell, Smith, & Zickuhr, 2010). According to Facebook's company information page (Facebook, 2015), the company began in 2004 and as of December 2014 Facebook had 1.39 billion monthly active users. Since it has become a popular social media site, several researchers have sought to gain a better understanding of how Facebook is used and have incorporated it into their studies (Chaulk & Jones, 2011; Joinson, 2008; Lenhart et al., 2010; Lyndon et al., 2011; Navarro & Jasinski, 2011;

Tom Tong & Walther, 2011; Tokunaga, 2011). The increase of social networking sites not only allows individuals to post pictures, status updates, and location updates, but to look at or comment on other individual's similar posts, which equates to the potential for a new supply of information provided to abusers (Baughman, 2010).

"Facebook stalking" or "social searching" is a concept that is jokingly mentioned among Facebook users. However, this concept has appeared to be commonly accepted as discovered in the research literature (Joinson, 2008; Lyndon et al., 2011; Tom Tong & Walther, 2011; Tokunaga, 2011). Interestingly, Tokunage (2011) found that "females tend to spend larger amounts of time on SNSs [social networking sites] when compared to male users" (p. 707). However, Tokunage (2011) was unable to determine a relationship between gender and Internet surveillance.

Lyndon et al. (2011) described the use of social networking sites in reference to jealous romantic ex-partners and their ability to cyberstalk or cyber harass their former partners. The authors described two ways that could be utilized either separately or collectively to cyberstalk. The first was cyber obsessional pursuit (COP), which they defined as "technological-based stalking behaviors to harass or demand intimacy from another person" (Lyndon et al., 2011, p. 711), while the second was obsessive relational intrusion (ORI) or the "overlapping construct of stalking" (Lyndon et al., 2011, p. 712). The study was completed through the use of an online survey of college students who had previously been in a serious relationship. Both the participant and their ex-partner had to have a Facebook account to participate in the study. Although this limited the research to only participants with Facebook accounts, it was important to do so in order to evaluate the phrase "Facebook stalking." In addition, Tom Tong and Walther (2011) concluded that after the termination of a relationship, Facebook serves "as a resource for covert information seeking and direct communication" (Tom Tong & Walther, 2011, p. 2).

The use of social networking sites, such as Facebook, to monitor other individual's routines is a difficult one to trace. Difficulty in tracing such actions is due to the anonymous nature that Facebook supplies; it is near impossible to track how often or if an individual has visited one's Facebook page (Chaulk & Jones, 2011).

Not many research studies have been able to continually assess the use of social networking sites, due to the changing fads of use such as, Myspace to Facebook to Twitter. While Twitter appears to be a new fad in the social networking scene, according to Twitter's company page (Twitter, Inc., 2015) Twitter was incorporated in 2007, and to date have 288 million monthly users. Compared to Facebook, Twitter is not as large; however, this does appear to be shifting. The unavailable information as to how newer social networking sites, such as Twitter, are being used to cyberstalk can be seen as a limitation to the research as a whole.

Cyberstalking as it pertains to law enforcement has brought forth both advantages and disadvantages. One beneficial aspect in handling cases of cyberstalking is that it creates a series of documented incidents. This aids law enforcement in its investigation, and allows investigators to present the documents to prosecutors, which in turn, aids prosecutors who prosecute cyberstalking cases. This could be true of other cybercrimes, as well. However, a disadvantage is that "police departments do not have the adequate resources to commit to investigation… which requires specific computer training" (King-Ries, 2010, p. 142). As supported in traditional stalking research, training of law enforcement is vital in cyberstalking as well.

Theoretical Explanations of Stalking

Researchers have used several different theoretical approaches to explain the concept of stalking. Some of the approaches have been through control balance (Nobles & Fox, 2013), criminal justice decision making (Reyns & Englebrecht, 2010), evolution theories (Duntley & Buss, 2012), and general strain (Ngo & Paternoster, 2013). The most widely used theories are

social learning theories (Fox et al., 2011; Cochron et al., 2011; Jennings, Park, Tomsich, Gover, & Akers, 2011; Sellers et al., 2005), attachment theory (Davis, Swan, & Gambone, 2012; Miller, 2012; Patton, Nobles, & Fox, 2010; Wilson, Ermshar, & Welsh, 2006), and routine activities theory (Holt & Bossler, 2009; Reyns et al., 2011; Reyns et al., 2012; Welsh & Lavoie, 2012).

Routine activities theory is one that more explicitly considers the victim, but as a vulnerable target, and typically refers to the motivation of the offender as simply a given (Cohen & Felson, 1979). Thus, the applicability of the routine activity theory to explain stalking is remarkably strong. The theory is examined in its applicability to stalking in general in order to further convey this idea. The main focus of the applicability of Routine Activities will be in regards to cybercrimes, since these are the crimes that generally cause the most debate.

Routine Activities Theory. The routine activities theory is one that was developed for the purpose of explaining the increase of crime rates in the United States. This theory was developed by Lawrence E. Cohen and Marcus Felson, both whom were professors at the University of Illinois in 1979. It was developed to explain the overall increase in the occurrence of crime in relation to surrounding societal changes. Other theories, such as the rational choice theory, concentrate on the individual criminals; the routine activity theory does not. Instead, Cohen and Felson (1979) examined the influences of the situations surrounding individual criminals. Rational choice theorists like Cohen and Felson often argue that "some people are more likely than others to confront situations where the benefits of crime are high and the costs are low" (Cullen & Agnew, 2011, p. 406). In the theory, routine activities were defined to be "any recurrent and prevalent activities which provide for basic population and individual needs…routine activities would include formalized work, as well as the provision of standard food, shelter, sexual outlet, leisure, social interaction, learning and childrearing" (Cohen & Felson, 1979, p. 593). Such activities could take place at the home or outside of the home.

Overall, the authors believed that crime occurred due to the convergence in time and space of a motivated offender, a suitable target, and a lack of capable guardianship (Jacoby, 2012). Cohen and Felson (1979) believed that the lack of any one of these elements (motivated offender, suitable target, and lack of capable guardianship) could prevent criminal activity. A motivated offender was described to be an individual who has criminal inclinations. Motivated offenders as defined in this theory are seen more as of a given and the ways in which criminal inclinations come about are not defined within the theory (Cullen & Agnew, 2011). A suitable target in essence was an item(s) or individual(s), valuable in character and seen to be attractive to the offender. While a capable guardian is simply anything or anyone that can protect or prevent the offender from obtaining or harming the suitable target.

Cohen and Felson (1979) related their approach to that of classical human ecological concepts. One approach they discussed was that their research did not examine why individuals or groups of individuals were criminally motivated, but instead that they took "criminal inclination as given and examine[d] the manner in which the spatio-temporal organization of social activities helps people to translate their criminal inclinations into actions" (Cohen & Felson, 1979, p. 589). The authors took into consideration the interdependence of criminal and noncriminal routine activities and how the change in one can reflect change in another.

As for the ecological nature of illegal acts it was concluded that "the structure of community organization as well as the level of technology in a society provide the circumstances under which crime can thrive" (Cohen & Felson, 1979, p. 590). The authors also explained the relationship between the community organization and the level of technology and how it could affect the capacity of motivated offenders to reach their suitable targets. Also, they explained the impact on the ability of capable guardians to protect their suitable targets. In other words, even the technological advances that were designed for legitimate purposes could aid motivated

offenders in their pursuit of suitable targets. Such advances could also become suitable targets themselves (i.e., automobiles, hunting weapons, small power tools, etc.). It is certain that the applicability of routine activities could be useful given the technological era that we are in today, than what the authors originally intended.

Testing the Routine Activity Theory. There have been several studies over the years which examine the applicability of routine activities. As society is now facing another set of changes, the applicability of routine activities to these new changes is being called into question. More specifically, there have been disputes on the applicability of the routine activity theory to cybercrimes. Cybercrimes are considered illegal acts that occur within cyberspace or in other words, via the use of the Internet. Some researchers have described cyberspace to simply be a new place to conduct old crimes, while some argue that the theories used to explain traditional crimes are not applicable to crimes committed via the Internet.

Recently, researchers have conducted studies in regards to cybercrimes such as cyber harassment, cyber bullying and cyberstalking using routine activities theory. These studies, the authors, key results, and findings are illustrated in the Table 3.

Table 3

A Sample of Research Studies and Findings Based on Routine Activities Theory

Author(s)	Year	Key Results	Support/Findings
Bossler, A. M., Holt, T. J., & May, D. C.	2012	Measures assessing proximity to motivated offenders the maintaining of social networking accounts were significant indicators of online harassment.	Yes- the results concluded supported the use of the routine activity theory to explain online harassment victimization
Holt, T. J., & Bossler, A. M.	2009	Discovered was the fact that it did not depend upon the amount of time a person spent online, but instead what activities they partook in while online.	Yes- the results concluded supported the use of the routine activity theory to explain online stalking victimization
Navarro, J. N., & Jasinski, J. L.	2011	Overall, 90% of teens who reported using the Internet did so at least once a week. It was shown that the victim's gender was significant in the likelihood of experiencing cyberbullying. Social networking sites were not found to be the most "dangerous" online activity, instead IM-ing was found to be more risky.	Yes- the predicted variance found in the analysis demonstrates the applicability of routine activity theory
Reyns, B. W., Henson, B. W., & Fisher, B. S.	2011	The number of photos posted online, as well as the number of social networking accounts open is a significant and positive predictor of online victimization. Allowing strangers access to personal online information, gender, and relationship status are indicators of online victimization and overall cyberstalking victimization.	Yes- the results concluded supported the use of the routine activity theory to explain cyberstalking victimization
Welsh, A., & Lavoie, J. A. A.	2012	Increasing amounts of time spent engaging with online social networking and high levels of online disclosure of personal information contribute to risks for cyberstalking.	Yes- provides support for the relevance of the concepts of routine activity theory and its ability to link online activities and cybercrime.
Yar, M.	2005	Convergence of time and space cannot be adjusted to fit the means needed to apply to cyberspace. There is zero space between two points in cyberspace, therefore, spatiality does not exist. Temporality does not exist either due to the fact that there is no temporal order of events in cyberspace.	No- motivated offenders and suitable targets did not meet the convergence of time and space as necessary to use the routine activity theory.

As illustrated in Table 3, all of the research articles found support for the applicability of routine activity theory in regards to cyber victimization except for one. While each of the crimes was conceptualized and measured differently, the common denominator was the environment in which they took place-cyberspace. It was this "virtual environment" that proved to be difficult for the various researchers to conceptualize, and in turn, led some to find a lack of support for routine activity theory. It is possible that traditional criminal theories may not be applicable to the virtual environment and cybercrimes.

Unlike the other research studies represented in Table 3, Yar (2005) was unable to find support for routine activity and cybercrimes. The main reason was due to the idea that the convergence of time and space was not met as stipulated in Cohen and Felson's (1979) original theory. Yar (2005) argued that there is zero distance between two points in cyberspace; therefore, spatiality does not exist. Furthermore, temporality does not exist, because there is no temporal order to events in cyberspace. Due to neither of these terms existing in Yar's definition, the three required elements cannot converge in time and space, which is why the theory was not meant to be used or applied to illegal acts that occur in the virtual world (Yar, 2005). However, Holt and Bossler (2009) disputed Yar's (2005) claims by stating that there was not enough empirical tests to support that the routine activity theory could not be applied to cybercrimes. It should be noted that Yar (2005) did not test this hypothesis using a sample of individuals; instead, the author completed a review of the original work of Cohen and Felson (1979).

On the other hand, Holt and Bossler (2009) were able to assess one's odds of being a cyber-victim by administering self-report surveys to college students. One key finding was that it did not depend upon the amount of time a person spent online, but instead what that person did while they were online that contributed to their likelihood of becoming a cyber-victim. In other

studies supporting the use of routine activity theory it was found that the amount of time spent online affected victimization, especially if the victim committed a high level of personal disclosure (Welsh & Lavoie, 2012). In conclusion, the authors advocate that the use of the routine activity theory should not be dismissed entirely (Holt & Bossler, 2009; Welsh & Lavoie, 2012).

To further support the use of the routine activities theory as an explanation for cybercrimes Reyns, Henson, and Fisher (2011) constructed their own conceptual definitions of online exposure to motivated offenders, online proximity to motivated offenders, online guardianship, online target attractiveness, and online/electronic deviant lifestyle. The authors collected data via a self-report victimization survey of undergraduate college students at an urban university. The researchers found support for the application of the routine activity theory to cyberstalking. As illustrated in Table 3, the researchers found that the number of photos posted online, as well as the number of social networking accounts that were open was a significant and positive predictor of online victimization. Also, by allowing strangers access to their personal online information such as their gender and their relationship status, individuals set themselves up to become suitable targets to motivated offenders. This provided evidence as to why the theory can be applied to cybercrimes in general as well as to cyberstalking specifically.

Reyns et al. (2011) focused on an issue widely disagreed on that as to whether or not a motivated offender and victim are able to converge in time and space, as shown in Yar (2005). Reyns et al. (2011) pointed out that although the two do not converge in the traditional sense, they were able to still come together through the use of networked devices (cyberspace). This notion is supported through Welsh and Lavoie (2012), where they defined cyberspace as being a new form of social environment; that is, an environment that facilitates the social interaction of

people from various physical locations in one virtual location. Virtual environments do not exist in time or space but instead serve as a medium in which individuals engage in routine activities (Reyns et al., 2011). This statement weakens Yar's (2005) argument that the convergence of time and space are not applicable to cybercrimes.

Welsh and Lavoie's (2012) study sought to examine the applicability of the routine activities theory to cyberstalking victimization of college students in three ways. They were: (1) if increased exposure to social networking sites increased the risk of cyberstalking victimization, (2) if increased willingness to disclose personal information on social networking sites increase the risk for cyberstalking victimization, and (3) does risk-taking traits that increase target suitability contribute to the risk of cyberstalking victimization. As stated before, the researchers found that if the individual committed a high level of personal disclosure through social networking sites, then they increased their risk of cyberstalking victimization.

While the research examined in Table 3 concentrates on social networking sites only one of the six studies did not. Navarro and Jasinski (2012) concluded that social networking sites were actually not the most dangerous in terms of risk for cyber victimization. The authors instead concluded that, IM-ing served to be a larger risk factor. However, it should be noted that this research study was conducted through samples of junior high and high school students. The cybercrime researchers examined was cyber bullying. Illustrated in Table 3, the researchers concluded that 90% of teenagers who reported using the Internet did so at least once a week. Bossler et al. (2012) also conducted their research of cyber harassment on junior high and high school participants. This leads future research to question if cyber victimization research should be conducted using younger individuals versus college-aged individuals.

Measuring guardianship was difficult to conceptualize and place in temporal order. Overall, it was concluded that online guardianship, as a deterrent of cyber victimization was a weak relationship (Holt & Bossler, 2009; Navarro & Jasinski, 2011; Reyns et al., 2011; Welsh & Lavoie, 2012). This is mainly due to the fact that it was unknown if cyber victimization occurred first, leading to the victim to put in place some form of online guardian (i.e., spyware detector) or if the "protector" was placed before the cyber victimization occurred.

However, this was not the cause when guardianship was examined in terms of a social guardianship as seen in Bossler et al. (2012). Bossler et al. (2012) conducted their research by measuring the participants' proximity to motivated offenders, guardianship, and target suitability. Guardianship was examined in several ways. The first concept of guardianship was considered to be physical guardianship, which was measured through the use of software to block access to certain websites or content. Social guardianship was broken into two measurements. The first was that of the computer location in the home (i.e., whether the computer was placed in a public setting such as the living room, or in a private setting such as a personal bedroom). Second, social guardianship was measured using a question that asked whether or not the participant associated with peers who committed deviant acts online. Personal guardianship was measured by the individual's personal skill level as it pertained to the use of computers. The last way in which guardianship was examined was through the measurement of how much an individual shared risky information online.

The research discovered that "students who maintained social networking sites and associated with peers who harassed others online increased their odds of victimization through their proximity to motivated offenders" (Bossler et al., 2012, p. 513). Overall, the researchers

concluded that routine activities theory was useful in explaining these acts that occurred in cyber space, and the way in which motivated offenders have access to suitable targets.

Throughout the years, researchers have found routine activities theory to be useful in explaining not only cybercrime in general, but specific cybercrimes such as cyberstalking, cyber harassment, and cyber bullying as well. Overall, the routine activities theory also can be applied to cyber victimization, as illustrated in Table 3.

Reoccurring themes have developed in all aspects of stalking. The first is that a more clear and concise way of conceptualizing and operationalizing the behaviors associated with traditional and cyberstalking needs to be created in order to develop a universal definition of each. A universal definition would greatly contribute to all areas of stalking, such as measuring, investigating, and prosecuting stalking incidents. Another theme is that stalking is routinely associated with domestic violence, therefore when viewed in this way, the victim-offender relationship is typically thought to be that of an intimate partner. However, the victim-offender relationship seen as the most dangerous is that of stranger. Third, with the development of technology, the use of social media networking sites to carry out stalking behaviors has greatly increased. Overall, with the advances in technology and its increased usage, it is difficult to separate the use of technology from behaviors in our daily lives, especially stalking behaviors. Therefore, the two means of stalking, traditional and cyber, should not be viewed as two different crimes, but instead as one.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Participants and Research Setting

The current study took place on the campus of Marshall University, a mid-sized university, located in the tri-state area of West Virginia, Kentucky, and Ohio. For the purposes of this research, all Marshall University students were included, that is, students of all races, ethnicities, ages, genders, academic status, etc. It should be noted that student populations prove to be beneficial because:

> students are easily accessible, student samples are cost-and-time efficient, researchers can measure change fairly easily with students, students are people too, students reflect culture, students tend to be close to the age category most often involved in crime/deviance,[and] students can learn from the research process. (Payne & Chappell, 2008, p. 183)

The second rationale for using a student population was due to the fact that rates of victimization are typically higher among college students (NW3C, 2015). Thus, it seemed appropriate to examine the phenomenon of traditional stalking and cyberstalking at the university (Björklund, et al., 2010; Cass & Rosay, 2012; Jordan et al., 2007; Lyndon et al., 2011; Reyns et al., 2011).

Key Variables

There are several key variables that are addressed in this study. The independent variable is that of the victim-offender relationship, while the dependent variable is traditional or cyberstalking behaviors. Stalking behaviors in this study was defined in two ways. The first way was through traditional stalking means, such as being followed, spied on, communicated with (in a non-electronic way, i.e. written letters), and/or threatened in a way in which the reasonable

person felt fearful. These behaviors could be carried over to include persons that the original victim was close to (i.e., family members, close friends, etc.). This definition was modified from definitions of stalking used in previous research that was described earlier (see Alexy et al., 2005; Baum et al., 2009; Basile et al., 2006; Goodno, 2007; Growland, 2013; Miller, 2012; Reyns & Englebrecht, 2010; Roberts, 2008; Shimizu, 2013; Storey & Hart, 2011; Tjaden, 2009). Second, stalking behavior was examined by way of nontraditional means, such as cyberstalking. It is important to note that cyberstalking contains the same behaviors contained within the definition of traditional stalking but is conducted through the use of an electronic device (i.e., telephone calls, text messages, or emails instead of written letters, through the use of social networking sites, etc.).

As stated previously, the independent variable is the victim-offender relationship and the definitions used in this study to describe the relationships were modified from Loftin (1987) and his colleagues. The independent variable was measured by asking the participant if the aforementioned behaviors were carried out by a current intimate partner (i.e., a person with whom they have a current personal and romantic relationship that is characterized by emotional intimacy or physical and sexual intimacy), an ex-intimate partner (i.e., a person with whom they previously shared physical or emotional intimacy and where that relationship was ended either by them, the other person, or by both of their wishes), a current friend (i.e., a person with whom they presently share a mutual affection that is characterized by having similar interests, hanging out on a regular basis, and conversing), an ex-friend (i.e., a person with whom they had previously shared a mutual affection but no longer associate with this person), an acquaintance (i.e., a person that they know slightly, but who they would not categorize as a friend or ex-friend), or by a stranger (i.e., a person they do not know). The participant was asked to categorize

the relationship between themselves and that of the offender based upon the definitions given on the second page of the survey.

In addition to the questions regarding the presence of stalking behaviors, the participants were asked questions that measured their "cyber presence." Cyber presence for the purpose of this research was defined as how often participants used various applications on social networking sites and was measured by ten questions located at the end of the survey. The questions pertained to how often the individual used the "check-in application" on their Facebook page or Twitter account, how many times the individual updated their statuses, uploaded pictures, etc. In the demographics section of the survey the participants were also asked to list all of the social media sites that they currently had (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, etc.).

Instrument

The instrument was a self-report survey located in Appendix A. Overall, the survey contained eight sections and each section varied in length of questions (i.e., sections one, two, four, and five contain fourteen questions each; section three contains three questions; section six contains two questions; section seven contains ten questions; section eight contains six questions). The survey questions were modified from previous research surveys (see: Buhi et al., 2008; Chaulk & Jones, 2011; DeBing, Bailer, Anders, Wagner, & Gallas, 2014).

In section one, there were some questions that addressed traditional stalking behaviors, and others that addressed cyberstalking behaviors. The first section asked the participant questions such as "Thinking back upon the previous school year, how many times do you believe another individual watched you from afar?," and "Thinking back upon the previous school year, how many times do you believe another individual has used your Facebook profile to obtain

information about you?" (for a complete list of questions please refer to Appendix A). If the participant indicated that none of the behaviors occurred, then they were directed to section four. If the participant answered with any number greater than zero they were then directed to section two, which addressed the victim's relationship to the offender. Here, the participant reported specifically whether the person as a current intimate partner, an ex-intimate partner, a current friend, an ex-friend, an acquaintance, or a stranger. The participants were given the definitions of each of these relationships as previously mentioned.

The third section of the survey pertained to whether or not the victim reported the behaviors. More specifically, the participant was asked that if the behaviors were reported, then who did the individual report the behaviors to. The options in this section were that of local police, campus police, friends/family members, resident advisor, or other (if other was selected they were asked to specify). Section three also addressed the question of the victim-offender relationship that represented the reported behaviors.

All of the questions in sections four, five, and six mirrored those of the previous sections but were rephrased to address whether or not the *participant* had committed any of the aforementioned behaviors. Section four of the survey mirrored that of the first, by asking the participant if they had committed any stalking behaviors. Similarly, the fifth section mirrored that of the second, by asking the participant to identify the relationship that had with the person who they were allegedly stalking. Staying in unison, the sixth section mirrored the third in addressing whether or not the behaviors were reported.

The seventh section addressed the cyber presence of the participant. Cyber presence was assessed through questions such as "How often do you upload pictures to social media sites?," "How often do you "check-in" at the places you are at on Facebook or Twitter?," etc. The

participants were asked to rank each as “0 times,” “1-3 times per week,” “4-6 times per week,” “7-9 times per week,” or “10 or more times per week.” As mentioned before, the last section contained demographic questions about the participant’s: gender, age, major, year in school, and race. The eighth section also asked the participant to list the various social media accounts that they currently had.

Data Collection Procedure

First, permission to conduct the research was obtained through the Office of Research Integrity (IRB). Then, the survey was pre-tested in an undergraduate criminal justice course, before it was administered to the sample of college students. This helped to correct a few grammatical errors as well as ensured that the survey was logical and properly measured the intended variables.

The researcher randomly selected current course offerings after sampling by college and by major. (This is explained in detail in the *sampling design* section.) Professors were contacted in several ways. The researcher first attempted to speak with the professors of the selected courses by going to their office during designated office hours. However, if the researcher was unable to catch the professor during these hours, the professor was then contacted by email. During initial contact, the researcher attempted to secure a time that would best work for the professor’s schedule to have the students complete the survey during a scheduled class time. This would ensure that the survey was completed in a face-to-face manner. The purpose for having the surveys completed this way, rather than in another form such as email, was to increase the response rate.

Once a time was secured, the researcher went to the classrooms (about 75 total) to distribute the surveys. After the researcher was briefly introduced by the professor, the

researcher described the purpose of the study. It was announced that the survey was completely voluntary and that there would be no penalty if they chose to not complete it. Students were also instructed to ask the researcher any questions if they needed any clarification on the directions or definitions given. Due to the sensitive nature of the questions being administered, participants were told that any time during the survey, if they were to feel uncomfortable, that they had the right to discontinue the survey.

Next, participants were provided with a letter of consent (Appendix B) to further ensure what the researcher had previously stated. The letter also informed participants that the survey would take no longer than 20 minutes to complete. After the participants read the letter of consent, the survey was administered. Once the participants were finished, they were instructed to place the surveys (filled out or left blank) into an envelope placed in the front of the room. The researcher remained in the room during the completion of the survey in order to answer any questions that might arise; however, the researcher either brought a book, an article, or something of that nature. This way the participants in the classroom did not feel pressured to participate or feel as though the researcher was watching them answer the questions.

Although it stated on the letter of consent that "by completing this survey and returning it you are also confirming that you are 18 years of age or older" (Appendix B), two of the participants who returned the survey indicated that they were only seventeen years of age. In compliance with the Office of Research Integrity (IRB), these surveys were immediately shredded by the researcher and none these answers were recorded into the SPSS database.

Since the study took place in the fall semester, the researcher began asking professors for participation during the third week of school. Attempts were made to reach professors during their designated office hours and by sending out group emails. During the seventh week of the

semester, thee researcher sent out another round of emails; however, this round was done through the use of a template letter/email. The template was created by the researcher in order for her to send out a uniform, yet more personal, email to each individual professor indicating the purpose of the contact, the specific courses that the researcher wished to survey, and to try and secure a date and time the survey could be administered. Email replies from each professor was recorded. Of the 112 professors emailed, about 47 professors responded with times that the survey could be administered. About 7 professors declined to have the survey administered in their classroom, mostly due to limited class time. Overall, there was approximately a 42% response rate from the professors who were emailed. According to Bachman and Schutt (2014), this response rate would be characterized as small. However, the researcher was still able to yield responses from about 9% of the total student population on the main campus, which should not be diminished.

Sampling Design

According to the known data on student enrollment there are about 13,000 students who attend Marshall University. In order to try about obtain a representative sample from this large population the researcher employed a multistage cluster sampling technique. Multistage cluster sampling is a technique in which repeated stages of listing and sampling are carried out in order to take a large population (such as Marshall University's Huntington campus) and create a practical sample frame (Bachman & Schutt, 2014).

In the first stage, colleges within Marshall University were randomly selected. Eight colleges exist at the university; however, the graduate college was excluded due to the fact that the students within the graduate college take classes in specific disciplines that are in other colleges. The researcher simply numbered the seven colleges housed on Marshall University's

Huntington campus (the list of colleges and departments were found using Marshall University's catalog). A random number generator was then used to randomly select three of the colleges.

From there the researcher listed the various departments within the colleges and numbered them. The researcher, using the same random number generator, randomly selected about half of departments within each of the selected colleges, giving fourteen departments to be included in the research. Once the departments were selected, using the same method, a list was compiled of the various courses that each department offered in the fall of 2014. The random numbers generator was used again to select about half of the courses from each department. This gave the researcher a total of 211 courses to be included in the sample. Courses such as independent studies, online courses, and internships were excluded due to the fact that there were no face-to-face meeting times that the survey could be administered during. Once the courses were selected, the researcher contacted each professor for permission to administer the survey, as previously mentioned. Of the 211 courses, about 75 of the classes were surveyed, giving the researcher a low response rate of 35.55% of the sampled courses (Bachman & Schutt, 2014). However, there was still a large number (1,040) of students who completed the survey.

The multistage cluster design was chosen because it allowed for the students to be surveyed through a probability method. By using this method it is more likely that the sample will be representative of the population as a whole. The use of a multistage cluster also made such a large university easier to sample in a representative manner. Another advantage is that a multistage cluster sample requires less prior information on the individual participants (Bachman & Schutt, 2014).

Human Subject Protection Issues

Participants were given a letter of consent (Appendix B) prior to their participation. This letter described the nature of the research, and informed them that participation was voluntary. Participants in the research were assured that completed surveys would remain anonymous, and to ensure this aspect the participants were asked to not place their name or student identification number on any part of the survey. If the participants wanted to withdraw from the study, at any time they were permitted to leave the survey blank without penalty.

It is important to note that the survey could cause psychological distress to participants, especially if they had been a victim of stalking or another harassing behavior. To address this issue, the researcher included the number to the Marshall University Police Department, as well as a link to a website that is devoted to helping stalking victims, on the consent letter. This ensured that if the participant felt uneasy after completing the survey that they had the resources to aid them. Also, by placing this information on the consent letter, all of the students had access to the information, even if they felt that they necessarily did not need the information.

Reliability and Validity Concerns

The overall reliability and validity of the research was enhanced by pre-testing the survey instrument before it was administered to the sample of students, although there were still a few limitations. The first issue is that while survey research as a method is stronger on reliability, it is weaker when it comes to validity compared to quasi or classical experiments. For instance, it is possible that participants under or over reported stalking behaviors (i.e., due to social desirability effects). In other words, participants could have under or over reported the victimization or offending of certain behaviors if they believed that by answering truthfully it would be socially unacceptable. However, attempts were made to reduce this from happening by

distributing an anonymous survey. Also, attempts were made to increase validity by framing the questions in a temporal fashion (e.g., “in the previous school year”). In addition, even though some of the survey items were taken or modified from previous studies, the item, “How many times in the past year has another individual without your permission sent unsolicited letters or emails to you?” was meant to be a measure of traditional stalking instead of cyberstalking. However, the researcher decided to not run the results collected for this question due to the fact that the question seems to measure both traditional and cyberstalking behavior. It is possible that the measurement validity was compromised for other items on the survey as well.

To some, another limitation was the use of a convenience sample of college students at one university. However, this limitation is justifiable due to the explanation given by Payne and Chappell (2008). Since stalking victimization is more likely to occur among this age demographic, it is likely that the findings in the study can be generalized to other universities or colleges that are similar in nature.

Analysis

In order to process this information, the data was entered into SPSS. Through the use of this statistical program, the researcher was able to conduct hypothesis testing. For example, to more closely examine the relationship between gender and the likelihood of cyberstalking (hypothesis four), a chi-square test of independence was conducted to determine statistical significance. If the relationship was found to be significant, Cramér’s *V* was computed to determine the strength of the relationship. In cases where a chi-square test could not be computed, the researcher examined percentages and frequencies instead. In particular, this was done for the first, second, and third hypotheses where the victim-offender relationship, the reporting behaviors of the participants, and the self-reported traditional or cyberstalking

victimization was examined. Additional variables were analyzed using the appropriate statistical tests or procedures.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Sample Demographics

Overall, the entire sample consisted of 1,040 student participants, which represented about 9% of the students enrolled on Marshall University's main campus. As shown in Table 4, of those surveyed, 55.3% were female and 44.7% were male. However, about 2.0% (n = 21) of respondents declined or forgot to identify their gender (see Table 4). Nonetheless, the gender breakdown of this sample slightly underrepresents females and overrepresents males compared to the overall gender representation on Marshall University's campus. Specifically, in 2014, the university reported that females comprised 58% and males comprised 42% of the student body (MU Institutional Research, 2014).

In terms of class status, 26.1% were freshmen, 21.7% were sophomores, 16.7% were juniors, 27.9% were seniors, and 7.6% were graduate students. It should be noted that almost 2.5% (n = 25) of the sample declined or forgot to identify their class status on the survey instrument. When compared to Marshall University's Institutional Research data (2014), all grade levels were overrepresented in this sample, namely freshman. This may be attributed to surveying a larger number of introductory level classes.

Ages ranged from 18 years to 54 years of age, with the majority of the sample falling between the ages of 18 and 21 (74.5%) with a mean age of 21. Also shown in Table 4, the next age group was 22 to 25 years of age (17.3%). Less than 10% of the students in the study were 26 or older (8.2%; n = 84). According to the data provided by MU Institutional Research Office (2014), the median age of undergraduate students was 22.4 years of age.

Regarding race, an open-ended item was used on the survey, allowing the students to identify their own race instead of using predetermined categories. As shown in Table 4, the majority of students were white (88.2%). There were fewer black (5%), Hispanic (1.1%), and Asian (1.4%) students. Exactly 2% of respondents reported that they were bi-racial. A larger percentage of students did not report their race at all (6.4%; n = 67). Nonetheless, the results found here were similar to the university's reported racial demographics with the student body being white (81.6%), black (5.7%), Hispanic (1.8%), Asian (1.2%), two or more races (2%), American Indian or Alaska Native (0.3%), Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (0.1%), nonresident alien (3.3%), and unknown (4.1%) (MU Institutional Research, 2014).

Table 4

Sample Demographics

Variable	**Category**	**Percent**	**n**
Gender			1,019
	Male	44.7	456
	Female	55.5	563
Year in School			1,105
	Freshman	26.1	265
	Sophomore	21.7	220
	Junior	16.7	170
	Senior	27.9	283
	Graduate	7.6	77
Age			1,014
	18-21	74.5	754
	22-25	17.3	175
	26+	8.2	84
Race			973
	White	88.2	858
	Black	5.0	49
	Hispanic	1.1	11
	Asian	1.4	14
	Other	2.3	22
	Bi Racial	2.0	19

Even though the researcher sampled departments and classes from three of the seven colleges (i.e., the College of Arts and Media, the College of Liberal Arts, and the College of Science), students from a variety of majors were included in the sample overall. That is, most students were in the College of Science (44.5%) or the College of Liberal Arts (26.8%), followed by the College of Health Professions (10.3%), and the College of Arts and Media (9.5%). There were fewer majors from the College of Education and Professional Development (2.5%) and the College of Business (2.2%). Representation of students from colleges other than what was sampled is due to the fact that many students from other colleges are required to take introductory classes within the College of Science or the College of Liberal Arts. For example, a large number of students at the university are required to take introduction to biology and introduction to sociology.

Some of the majors selected in the aimed colleges were Biology (12.5%), Chemistry (4.7%), Psychology (4.6%), Music Education (4.3%) and those who identified as being "undecided" (2.8%). Four percent (n = 42) of the students surveyed declined or forgot to answer the question regarding their major. Further analyses, showed that almost 8% (n = 81) of students indicated that they were a double major.

The Victim-Offender Relationship

In cases of traditional stalking, the most common victim-offender relationship among college students is that of a stranger (33.4%; n = 193) instead of an ex-friend as proposed in the first hypothesis. As shown in Table 5, after strangers, the second most common relationship reported was an acquaintance (23%; n = 239), followed by an ex-intimate partner (22.3%; n = 232), and current friend (17.6%; n = 183). The reported relationship in incidents involving traditional stalking behaviors was less likely to be that of a current intimate partner (8.2%; n =

85) or an ex-friend (6.8%; n = 70). In a little over 6% of the cases (n = 64), students indicated that there was more than one relationship involved among these traditional stalking behaviors. For example, common relationship combinations were that of an acquaintance and a stranger or a current intimate and ex-intimate partner.

When examining each item individually as it pertains to physical stalking, students indicated that it was common that the person was an ex-intimate partner who physically spied on them (4.5%; n = 47), waited outside their house (2.9%; n = 30), and waited outside their work (2.3%; n = 24). While this finding is contradictory to what was hypothesized, it is consistent with the domestic violence and stalking literature (Blaauw et al., 2002; Coleman, 1997; Gover, et al., 2008; Ferreira & Matos, 2013; Logan & Walker, 2009; McEwan, et al., 2012; Sinclair, 2012). However, besides ex-intimate partners, it was reported that the relationship reported by students of those who waited outside of their class was typically a current friend (4.2%; n = 44). Almost one-quarter of the sample reported that another person physically followed them. Of these, students reported that this person was unknown to them or a stranger (9%; n = 93) (see Table 5). The largest percentage of those who watched the person from afar (18.6%; n = 193) was also reported to be a stranger (18.6%; n = 193). This could be for a variety of reasons. For instance, it is possible that some students perceived that they were being watched by a stranger in a public setting when they actually were not being watched but that another person unknown to them had looked in their direction, providing the student with that misperception. Nonetheless, several students felt compelled to indicate that they caught people looking at them from a distance, yet whether it was in a threatening or nonthreatening way cannot be determined from the data gleaned here. Last, for a few of these items, some students reported more than one relationship

for traditional stalking behaviors (6.2%; n = 64). Common combinations for this were current intimate partner and current friend and acquaintance and stranger.

Table 5

Traditional Stalking Behaviors and the Victim-Offender Relationship

	Current Intimate Partner	**Ex-Intimate Partner**	**Current Friend**	**Ex-Friend**	**Acquaintance**	**Stranger**	**More than one relationship indicated**
	% (f)	% (f)	% (f)	% (f)	% (f)	% (f)	% (f)
physically watched you from afar	2.2 (23)	7.1 (74)	4.6 (48)	2.0 (21)	7.0% (73)	**18.6 (193)**	3.3 (34)
physically followed you	1.5 (16)	3.5 (36)	3.3 (34)	1.1 (11)	5.8 (60)	**8.9 (93)**	1.1 (11)
physically spied on you	0.8 (8)	**4.5 (47)**	1.4 (15)	1.8 (19)	3.7 (38)	3.9 (41)	0.9 (9)
waited outside your house	0.8 (8)	**2.9 (30)**	2.8 (29)	0.6 (6)	1.6 (17)	0.5 (5)	0.2 (3)
waited outside your work	1.2 (12)	**2.3 (24)**	1.3 (13)	0.4 (4)	1.3 (14)	1.2 (12)	0.3 (3)
waited outside your class	1.7 (18)	2.0 (21)	**4.2 (44)**	0.9 (9)	3.6 (37)	0.3 (3)	0.4 (4)
Total	8.2 (85)	22.3 (232)	17.6 (183)	6.8 (70)	23 (239)	**33.4 (347)**	6.2 (64)

In opposition to the proposed hypothesis, the most common victim-offender relationship for all reported cyberstalking behaviors among college students was an ex-intimate partner (45.4%; n = 472). For all cyberstalking behaviors, the second most common reported relationship was an acquaintance (31.2%; n = 325), followed by an ex-friend (17.7%; 183) (see Table 6). Additionally, students reported that there was more than one relationship (16.5%; n = 171) among those who were cyberstalking them. For instance, the combination of ex-intimate partner and acquaintance were routinely reported together. While strangers comprised those who were most likely to stalk students in a traditional sense as described earlier, only 12.8% (n = 133) were reported to engage in cyberstalking behaviors, followed by a current friend (12.3%; n = 127), and a current intimate partner (8.5%; n = 88).

When examining each reported cyberstalking behavior individually, students self-reported that it was an ex-intimate partner who used Facebook or Twitter to "keep tabs" on them (12.7%; n = 132), tried adding their friends/family/coworkers to their friends list on Facebook (9.2%; n = 96), began following their friends/family/coworkers on Twitter (6.8%; n = 71), sent their friends/family/coworkers messages (5.3%; n = 55), or showed up at places they mentioned they would be on Facebook or Twitter (3.4%; n = 35) (see Table 6). The only cyberstalking behavior that was reported to occur by someone other than an ex-intimate partner was an acquaintance (9.6%; n = 99), but only when using their Facebook profile to obtain information about them. The difference here could be that students may have associated this behavior with an employer checking social media sites to obtain information regarding their character. Last, and similar to what was mentioned earlier, some students indicated that there was more than one relationship among those who engaged in these cyberstalking behaviors. The most common

combinations were current intimate partner and ex-intimate partner, current friend and acquaintance, and current intimate partner, ex-intimate partner, and current friend.

Table 6

Cyberstalking Behaviors and the Victim-Offender Relationship

	Current Intimate Partner	**Ex-Intimate Partner**	**Current Friend**	**Ex-Friend**	**Acquaintance**	**Stranger**	**More than one relationship indicated**
	% (f)	% (f)	% (f)	% (f)	% (f)	% (f)	% (f)
showed up at places you mentioned on Facebook or Twitter?	0.6 (6)	**3.4 (35)**	0.9 (9)	0.9 (9)	3.2 (33)	0.9 (9)	1.1 (11)
used Facebook or Twitter to "keep tabs"	2.5 (26)	**12.7 (132)**	3.0 (31)	3.7 (38)	5.6 (58)	1.4 (15)	5.2 (55)
used your Facebook profile to obtain information	1.6 (17)	8.0 (83)	3.3 (34)	3.6 (37)	**9.5 (99)**	4.4 (46)	4.6 (47)
tried adding your friends/family/coworkers to their friends list on Facebook	1.4 (15)	**9.2 (96)**	2.4 (25)	4.3 (45)	6.6 (69)	2.6 (27)	3.4 (35)
began following your friends/family/coworkers on Twitter	1.2 (12)	**6.8 (71)**	1.6 (17)	3.4 (35)	4.1 (43)	2.2 (23)	2.2 (22)
sent your friends/family/co-workers messages	1.2 (12)	**5.3 (55)**	1.1 (11)	1.8 (19)	2.2 (23)	1.3 (13)	1.1 (12)
Total	8.5 (88)	**45.4 (472)**	12.3 (127)	17.7 (183)	31.2 (325)	12.8 (133)	16.5 (171)

Reported Stalking Behaviors

Of the traditional and cyberstalking behaviors that were reported, regardless of the victim-offender relationship, the majority of students did not report stalking behaviors to law enforcement as show in Table 7, which lends support for the third hypothesis. Here, law enforcement included both the campus police and local law enforcement (.8%; n = 8). Other students indicated that they reported the stalking activity to campus police and/or local law enforcement in combination with reporting the behaviors to friends or family, for example (.11%; n = 11). Thus, it is possible that nearly 19 students reported the stalking behaviors to law enforcement overall. Given what is known about the lack of reporting dangerous or threatening behavior to law enforcement, this is not surprising. This is coupled with the fact that the majority of students did not report the behaviors to anyone at all (78.6%; n = 795).

Aside from not reporting the behaviors at all, if a student was to report the behavior, they were more likely to tell a friend and/or family member (18.3%; n = 185) or a combination of friends and/or family members or a resident advisor (.8%; n = 8) rather than report the incidents to law enforcement (see Table 7). Moreover, some participants responded to the category of "other" in the survey and provided a written response, which is not shown in Table 7. While written answers varied, the most common theme among written answers was that students reported the behavior(s) to a manager and/or mentor. The original research question addressed whether or not the victim-offender relationship effected the reporting of the behaviors to law enforcement; however, there was not enough information provided for a statistical test to be conducted.

Table 7

To Whom the Students Reported the Stalking Behaviors

Law Enforcement			Friends and/or Family Members	Combination of Law Enforcement and Other Relationship	Combination of Relationships not including Law Enforcement	Behaviors not Reported
Local Police	Campus Police	Law Enforcement Total				
% (f)	% (f)	% (f)	% (f)	% (f)	% (f)	% (f)
.4 (4)	.4 (4)	.8 (8)	18.3 (185)	.11 (11)	.8 (8)	78.6 (795)

Reported Traditional and Cyberstalking Activities

As illustrated in Table 8, if a stalking behavior occurred, it was more likely that the behavior was performed using social media or the computer instead of with one's physical presence in a traditional sense. This finding supports the third proposed hypothesis. In addition, it is important to note that both traditional and cyberstalking victimization was reported by about one-quarter or less of the students sampled.

The frequency for which most of the victimization occurred was one to three times in the previous school year (see Table 8). That is, students reported fewer stalking behaviors happening at increased intervals such as 4-6 times in the previous school year or 7-9 times in the previous school year. For example, the most common self-reported traditional stalking behavior was when an individual was physically watched them from afar (26.4%; n = 273 at least 1-3 times in the previous school year); however, as previously mentioned this could be assumed to be the result of another individual watching them in a nonthreatening way in a certain social or public setting. Moreover, 200 students (19.3%) reported that someone physically followed them at least 1-3 times in the previous school year, which is rather alarming. Yet still, students reported that that were physically spied on (13.3%; n = 138 at least 1-3 times in the previous school year) or that

someone waited out of them classroom (9.9%; n = 103 at least 1-3 times in the previous school year). Fewer students indicated that that someone waited outside their house 1-3 times in the previous school year (6.8%; n = 70) or their work (6.6%; n = 68).

As shown in Table 8, the most common self-reported cyberstalking behavior was when another person tried using the student's Facebook profile to obtain information about them (26.5%; n = 274 at least 1-3 times per week), closely followed by when another person tried adding the student's friends, family, or coworkers to their own friends list on Facebook (24.2 %; n = 251 at least 1-3 times in the previous school year). Using Facebook or Twitter to "keep tabs" on the student was also reported to occur 1-3 times in the previous school year by a large number of students (22.7%; n = 235). Although fewer, 16.8% (n = 174) of students indicated that at least 1-3 times in the previous school year another person began following their friends, family members, or coworkers on Twitter. It was less common for the student to report that they were cyberstalked by someone who showed up at the same locations that they had posted on Facebook or Twitter (8.3%; n = 86 at least 1-3 times in the previous school year) or for another person to send messages to their friends, family members, or coworkers (9.7%; n = 101).

Table 8

Students Self-Reported Traditional Stalking and Cyberstalking Victimization

Traditional Stalking Behaviors	**0 times** % (f)	**1-3 times** % (f)	**4-6 times** % (f)	**7-9 times** % (f)	**10 ≤ times** % (f)
Physically watched you from afar	55 (568)	26.4 (273)	10.6 (110)	2.0 (21)	5.9 (61)
Physically followed you	76.5 (792)	19.3 (200)	2.7 (28)	.9 (9)	.6 (6)
Physically spied on you	82.9 (857)	13.3 (138)	2.5 (26)	.6 (6)	.6 (6)
Waited outside your house	91.4 (948)	6.8 (70)	1.0 (10)	.6 (6)	.3 (3)
Waited outside your work	92.5 (959)	6.6 (68)	.8 (8)	-	.2 (2)
Waited outside your class	87.5 (907)	9.9 (103)	1.8 (19)	.3 (3)	.5 (5)
Cyberstalking Behaviors	**0 times** % (f)	**1-3 times** % (f)	**4-6 times** % (f)	**7-9 times** % (f)	**10 ≤ times** % (f)
Showed up at places you mentioned on Facebook or Twitter	90.1 (935)	8.3 (86)	.8 (8)	.4 (4)	.5 (5)
Used Facebook or Twitter to "keep tabs" on you	65.6 (680)	22.7 (235)	5.3 (55)	2.4 (25)	4.1 (42)
Used your Facebook profile to obtain information about you	63.4 (656)	26.5 (274)	5.8 (60)	1.5 (16)	2.8 (29)
Tried adding your friends, family, or coworkers to their friends list on Facebook	67.8 (704)	24.2 (251)	4.4 (46)	1.5 (16)	2.0 (21)
Began following your friends/family/coworkers on Twitter	77.2 (801)	16.8 (174)	3.2 (33)	1.3 (13)	1.6 (17)
Sent your friends/family/co-workers messages	87.7 (909)	9.7 (101)	1.3 (13)	.8 (8)	.6 (6)

Females and Cyberstalking Behaviors

As stated in the fourth hypothesis, it was predicted that female students would engage in cyberstalking behaviors at a higher rate than male students. In order to define cyberstalking, the researcher asked questions regarding how often per week the participant completed the following activities: visit someone's (other than their current or ex intimate partner) Facebook page, visit someone's (other than their current or ex intimate partner) Twitter feed, visit their current intimate partner's Facebook page, visit their current intimate partner's Twitter feed, visit their ex-intimate partner's Facebook page, and visit their ex-intimate partner's Twitter feed. The response categories for these items were "0 times," "1-3 times," "4-6 times," "7-9 times," or "10 or more times" per week. While not every participant in the sample elected to answer these questions, the results from those who did can be seen in Table 9 with each of the highest responses signified in bold text. The majority of students in the sample indicated that they did not take part in any of these behaviors, and thus, replied with an answer of "0 times." And overall, students reported engaging in these behaviors mostly "1-3 times" per week as opposed to "4-6 times" per week, "7-9 times" per week, or "10 or more times" per week.

When examining the frequency and percentage data and the differences among male and female students' cyberstalking behaviors, it appears that female students engaged in cyberstalking behaviors more frequently than their male counterparts (see Table 9). In only four of the twenty-four categories (not including the response of "0 times") did males report engaging in cyberstalking behaviors more frequently than females. For example, slightly more males indicated that they visited another's Twitter (not their current/ex intimate partner) with a response of "10 or more times" per week (5.5%; n = 23) than females (5.1%; n = 27). Additionally, a slightly higher number of males visited their current intimate partner's Twitter at least "1-3

times" per week (14.5%; n = 60) than females (14.4%; n = 76) as well as visited their ex-intimate partner's Twitter feed "1-3 times" per week (male 8.7%; n = 36 versus female 8.2%; n = 43).

Because it appears that females overall responded higher than males in every other category other than those previously mentioned, a chi-square test of independence was conducted (see Table 9). When examining gender and how often they reported visiting another person's (not their current or ex-intimate partner) Facebook page, the relationship between these variables was statistically significant, χ^2 (4, n = 946) = 26.763, p<.001. To examine this further, Cramér's *V* was selected as the appropriate measure of association since the tables were larger than 2 X 2 (Gau, 2015). However, it was concluded that gender has a weak or small effect in determining how often the student reported visiting another person's Facebook page (Cramér's *V* = .168).

Chi-square tests were also performed to examine the relationship between the other variables; however, the results were not significant for the questions that pertained to how often the student visited another's Twitter feed (not current/ex-intimate partner), how often they visited their current intimate partner's Facebook page, and how often they visited their current intimate partner's Twitter feed (see Table 9). Moreover, the statistical test could not be performed at all for the remaining items shown in the table, because some of the expected frequencies were not greater than five, which is an important and required element of the test.

Table 9

Self-Reported Cyberstalking Offending Per Week by Gender

	0 times % (f)	**1-3 times** % (f)	**4-6 times** % (f)	**7-9 times** % (f)	**10 ≤ times** % (f)	χ^2
How often do you visit another's Facebook (not current/ex intimate partner)						26.763*
Male	**42 (175)**	39.1 (163)	12.2 (51)	2.6 (11)	4.1 (17)	
Female	26.7 (141)	**49.1 (260)**	**13 (69)**	**4.3 (23)**	**6.8 (36)**	
Total from Sample	33.4 (316)	**44.7 (423)**	12.7 (120)	3.6 (34)	5.6 (53)	
How often do you visit another's Twitter (not current/ex intimate partner)						-
Male	**57.7 (240)**	25.5 (106)	8.4 (35)	2.9 (12)	**5.5 (23)**	
Female	49.5 (262)	**30.8 (163)**	**11 (58)**	**3.6 (19)**	5.1 (27)	
Total from Sample	**53.1 (502)**	28.5 (269)	9.8 (93)	3.3 (31)	5.3 (50)	
How often do you visit your current intimate partner's Facebook						-
Male	**68.6 (284)**	23.2 (96)	4.3 (18)	1.9 (8)	1.9 (8)	
Female	60.4 (319)	**29 (153)**	**5.3 (28)**	**2.5 (13)**	**2.8 (15)**	
Total from Sample	**64 (603)**	26.4 (249)	4.9 (46)	2.2 (21)	2.4 (23)	
How often do you visit your current intimate partner's Twitter						-
Male	**78.5 (325)**	**14.5 (60)**	3.4 (14)	1.7 (7)	1.9 (8)	
Female	75.9 (401)	14.4 (76)	**5.1 (27)**	**2.5 (13)**	**2.1 (11)**	
Total from Sample	**77.1 (726)**	14.4 (136)	4.4 (41)	2.1 (20)	2 (19)	
How often do you visit your ex-intimate partner's Facebook						-
Male	**89.2 (372)**	9.8 (41)	0.2 (1)	0 (0)	**0.7 (3)**	
Female	84.7 (447)	**11.9 (63)**	**1.9 (10)**	**0.9 (5)**	0.6 (3)	
Total from Sample	**86.7 (819)**	11 (104)	1.2 (11)	0.5 (5)	0.6 (6)	
How often do you visit your ex-intimate partner's Twitter						-
Male	**90.4 (376)**	**8.7 (36)**	0 (0)	0.2 (1)	0.7 (3)	
Female	88.5 (463)	8.2 (43)	**2.1 (11)**	**0.4 (2)**	**0.8 (4)**	
Total from Sample	**89.4 (839)**	8.4 (79)	1.2 (11)	0.3 (3)	0.7 (7)	

*p<.001

Additional Findings

Self-Reported Social Media Use by Gender. To examine the extent to which students used social media, the researcher asked the following questions: "How often do you "check-in" on Facebook or Twitter?", "How often do you upload pictures to social media," "How often do you 'tweet'?", and "How often do you post a status update on Facebook?" The response categories for these items were "0 times," "1-3 times," "4-6 times," "7-9 times," or "10 or more times" per week. Table 10 below illustrates the responses provided for each question and the most common response is in bold text. From the total sample it should be noted that not every participant chose to answer these questions. From those who did, the largest number of participants responded that they engaged in the activity in question "0 times" per week, except for the question about how often they upload pictures. Aside from answering that they did not participate in these behaviors, when students did partake, they did so about "1-3 times" per week more than any other amount of time.

At first glance, when examining the results by gender, it appears females reported "checking-in" on Facebook or Twitter 1-3 times per week (19.5% n = 102), more so than males (13.7%; n = 57) (see Table 10). A chi-square test of independence showed that this was statistically significant, χ^2 (4, n = 939) = 14.076, $p < .01$. However, upon further statistical examination, there was no substantive significance. The strength of this association was weak (Cramér's $V = .122$), which means that although this relationship was not due to sampling error, gender had a weak or small effect in determining how often the student "checks in" to either Facebook or Twitter.

Similar results were found when examining gender differences and how often the student "tweets," χ^2 (4, n = 946) = 17.51, $p < .01$) and how often the student posted status updates on

Facebook, χ^2 (4, n = 946) = 24.02, $p < .001$) (see Table 10). Again, although these relationships were statistically significant, there was a weak association among the variables. However, the differences were stronger when it came to uploading pictures. For example, 38.1% of males selected “0 times” while only 13.8% of females selected the same response. Additionally, a larger percentage of females indicated uploading pictures 1-3 times, 4-6 times, 7-9 times, and 10 or more times per week compared to males. A chi-square test of independence showed that the relationship between these variables was statistically significant, χ^2 (4, n = 945) = 85.27, $p < .001$. Unlike the other variables, the strength of the relationship was moderate (Cramér’s $V = .300$).

Table 10

Self-Reported Social Media Use per Week by Gender

	0 times % (f)	**1-3 times** % (f)	**4-6 times** % (f)	**7-9 times** % (f)	**10 ≤ times** % (f)	χ^2	**Cramér's *V***
How often do you "check-in" at places using Facebook or Twitter?						**14.076***	**.122**
Male	**78.8 (328)**	13.7 (57)	1.2 (5)	**1.2 (5)**	**5 (21)**		
Female	75.5 (395)	**19.5 (102)**	**2.1 (11)**	1.1 (6)	1.7 (9)		
Total from Sample	**77 (723)**	16.9 (159)	1.7 (16)	1.2 (11)	3.2 (30)		
How often do you "tweet"?						**17.51***	**.136**
Male	**51.6 (215)**	**25.7 (107)**	8.9 (37)	2.4 (10)	11.5 (48)		
Female	42.2 (223)	24.2 (128)	**10 (53)**	**5.9 (31)**	**17.8 (94)**		
Total from Sample	**46.3 (438)**	24.8 (235)	9.5 (90)	4.3 (41)	15 (142)		
How often do you upload pictures?						**85.27****	**.300**
Male	**38.1 (159)**	53.7 (224)	5 (21)	1.9 (8)	1.2 (5)		
Female	13.8 (73)	**65.7 (347)**	**13.6 (72)**	**4.2 (22)**	**2.7 (14)**		
Total from Sample	24.6 (232)	**60.4 (571)**	9.8 (93)	3.2 (30)	2 (19)		
How often do you post a status update on Facebook?						**24.02****	**.159**
Male	**55.9 (233)**	35.7 (149)	3.6 (15)	2.4 (10)	**2.4 (10)**		
Female	41 (217)	**47.4 (251)**	**7.2 (38)**	**2.5 (13)**	1.9 (10)		
Total from Sample	**47.6 (450)**	42.3 (400)	5.6 (53)	2.4 (23)	2.1 (20)		

*p < .01, **p < .001

Cyber Offending by Grade Level. When examining self-reported cyber offending by grade level, cyber presence was defined the same way as when examining cyber offending by gender. That is, students indicated how many times per week they used each type of social media using the response categories, "0 times," "1-3 times," "4-6 times," "7-9 times," or "10 or more times" per week As shown in Table 11, the highest response rate is provided in bold text for each category.

Overall, the data in Table 11 show that students are most likely to use social media 1-3 times per week even though large numbers of students reported that they do not use social media

at all per week. In the category, “1-3 times” per week, the most prominent grade level to at least half of the questions were seniors. Specifically, 46.8% (n = 126) of seniors reported visiting a non-intimate or non-ex-intimate partner’s Facebook page at least 1-3 times per week, followed by 35.6% (n = 95) of seniors who reported visiting a current intimate partner’s Facebook page at least 1-3 times per week. In addition seniors were also more likely than the other grade levels to visit an ex-intimate partner’s Facebook page (13.4%; n= 36). On the other hand, sophomores answered the highest to two of the six questions, “How often do you visit a non-intimate partner’s Twitter feed” (36.2%; n = 72), and “How often do you visit your ex-intimate partner’s Twitter feed” (11.6%; n = 23). Freshmen reported the most use of visiting a current intimate partner’s Twitter feed 1-3 times per week more than any other grade level (19%; n = 47). The use of social media by juniors and graduate students “1-3 times” per week was less than those of their counterparts.

Even though no distinct patterns were evident among each grade level, a chi-square test for independence was conducted to examine the relationship between class status and cyberstalking behaviors more closely (see Table 11). For instance, while the relationship between how often the student visited a non-intimate partner’s Twitter feed was found to be significant, χ^2 (16, n = 941) = 39.009, $p < .001$), the strength of this relationship was weak (Cramér’s $V = .102$). This was also true when examining how often the student visited their current intimate partner’s Facebook account, χ^2 (16, n = 938) = 27.342, $p < .05$). In this case, the relationship was not due to sampling error, but in the end, the relationship was weak as evident by the small differences between classes. Moreover, there was no statistical significance between the variables class status and the item, “How often the student visited another person’s

Facebook?" A chi-square analyses could not be performed for the other items as the expected frequencies for some of the cells were too small for the test.

Table 11

Self-Reported Cyberstalking by Grade Level per Week

	0 times % (f)	**1-3 times** % (f)	**4-6 times** % (f)	**7-9 times** % (f)	**10 ≤ times** % (f)	χ^2
How often do you visit another's Facebook (not current/ex intimate partner)						**21.313**
Freshman	**37.1 (92)**	46 (114)	8.9 (22)	2.8 (7)	5.2 (13)	
Sophomore	34.5 (69)	43 (86)	12 (24)	2.5 (5)	**8 (16)**	
Junior	31 (48)	44.5 (69)	17.4 (27)	**4.5 (7)**	2.6 (4)	
Senior	30.1 (81)	**46.8 (126)**	11.9 (32)	**4.5 (12)**	6.7 (18)	
Graduate	31.4 (22)	40 (28)	**21.4 (15)**	4.3 (3)	2.9 (2)	
How often do you visit another's Twitter (not current/ex intimate partner)						**39.009****
Freshman	49.2 (122)	30.2 (75)	10.1 (25)	3.6 (9)	6.9 (17)	
Sophomore	38.7 (77)	**36.2 (72)**	**14.1 (28)**	3.5 (7)	**7.5 (15)**	
Junior	59.4 (92)	23.2 (36)	12.3 (19)	2.6 (4)	2.6 (4)	
Senior	59.5 (160)	25.7 (69)	6.3 (17)	**3.7 (10)**	4.8 (13)	
Graduate	**67.1 (47)**	24.3 (17)	5.7 (4)	1.4 (1)	1.4 (1)	
How often do you visit your current intimate partner's Facebook						**27.342***
Freshman	**68.8 (170)**	21.9 (54)	**6.1 (15)**	0.8 (2)	2.4 (6)	
Sophomore	66.3 (132)	20.6 (41)	5.5 (11)	4 (8)	**3.5 (7)**	
Junior	68.4 (106)	24.5 (38)	3.9 (6)	1.9 (3)	1.3 (2)	
Senior	55.8 (149)	**35.6 (95)**	3.7 (10)	2.2 (6)	2.6 (7)	
Graduate	60 (42)	30 (21)	5.7 (4)	**2.9 (2)**	1.4 (1)	
How often do you visit your current intimate partner's Twitter						**--**
Freshman	72.2 (179)	**19 (47)**	5.6 (14)	0.8 (2)	2.4 (6)	
Sophomore	67.8 (135)	18.1 (36)	**6 (12)**	**4 (8)**	**4 (8)**	
Junior	78.7 (122)	11 (17)	5.2 (8)	3.9 (6)	1.3 (2)	
Senior	**84.6 (226)**	11.2 (30)	1.9 (5)	1.5 (4)	0.7 (2)	
Graduate	87 (60)	8.7 (6)	2.9 (2)	0 (0)	1.4 (1)	
How often do you visit your ex-intimate partner's Facebook						**--**
Freshman	87.9 (218)	10.1 (25)	0.4 (1)	0.4 (1)	**1.2 (3)**	
Sophomore	83.9 (167)	11.6 (23)	2.5 (5)	**1 (2)**	1 (2)	
Junior	**90.3 (140)**	8.4 (13)	0.6 (1)	0 (0)	0.6 (1)	
Senior	85.5 (230)	**13.4 (36)**	0.4 (1)	0.7 (2)	0 (0)	
Graduate	85.7 (60)	10 (7)	**4.3 (3)**	0(0)	0(0)	
How often do you visit your ex-intimate partner's Twitter						**--**
Freshman	87.1 (216)	10.1 (25)	1.2 (3)	0 (0)	**1.6 (4)**	
Sophomore	84.3 (167)	**11.6 (23)**	**2 (4)**	0.5 (1)	1.5 (3)	
Junior	90.8 (138)	7.2 (11)	1.3 (2)	**0.7 (1)**	0 (0)	
Senior	**93.2 (248)**	6 (16)	0.4 (1)	0.4 (1)	0 (0)	
Graduate	93 (66)	5.6 (4)	1.2 (11)	0.3 (3)	0.7 (7)	

*p < .05, **p < .001

Self-Reported Social Media Use by Grade Level. Self-reported social media use among the different grade levels also was examined. The highest response rate is provided in bold text for each category (see Table 12). For most categories, there were no explicit differences. For instance, similar percentages of students in all grade levels reported using Twitter (through the behavior of "tweeting") at least 1-3 times per week. On the other hand, a larger discrepancy was found among students who reported "tweeting" 10 or more times per week. Namely, 24.5% (n = 49) of sophomores and 20.2% (n = 50) of freshmen claimed that they tweeted 10 more times each week compared to 12.3% (n = 19) of juniors, 8.6% (n = 23) of seniors, and 1.4% (n = 1) graduate students. A chi-square test of independence was conducted to examine this relationship further. The relationship was significant, χ^2 (16, n = 942) = 68.372, $p <$ .001; however, the analysis showed that this was a weak association (Cramér's V = .135) (Gau, 2015).

As shown in Table 12, class differences in using Facebook to post a status update did not yield large discrepancies. However, more underclassmen reported using Facebook "0 times" per week to post an update on Facebook (55.6%; n = 138) compared to graduate students (37.1%; n = 26). Similarly, almost half of the sophomores (47%; n = 94) reported using Facebook "0 times." Because there were low observed frequency counts for some of the cells, a chi-square test of independence could not be computed. This was also the case for the items, "How often do you 'check-in' at places using Facebook or Twitter," and "How often do you upload pictures."

Even though a statistical test could not be performed, it is noteworthy that freshman (19.1%; n = 47) and sophomores (19.6%; n = 39) were more likely than upper classmen (15.5%; n = 24 juniors, 13.5%; n = 36 seniors, and 17.1%; n = 12 graduate students) to self-report using Facebook or Twitter to "check-in" at places at least 1-3 times per week (see Table 12). When

asked how often they uploaded pictures (social media outlet not described), there was not one level of class status (underclassmen vs upperclassmen) that stood out from the rest. Yet, 66% (n = 132) of sophomores reported uploading pictures at least 1-3 times per week more so than the other grade levels. Freshman had the highest rate of uploading pictures “4-6 times” per week (12.5%; n = 31); however the other class ranks were clustered around 9% except that of graduate students (5.8%; n = 4).

Table 12

Self-Reported Media Use by Class Status

	0 times % (f)	**1-3 times** % (f)	**4-6 times** % (f)	**7-9 times** % (f)	**10 ≤ times** % (f)	χ^2
How often do you "check-in" at places using Facebook or Twitter?						**-**
Freshman	74.4 (183)	19.1 (47)	0.8 (2)	0.8 (2)	**4.9 (12)**	
Sophomore	74.4 (148)	**19.6 (39)**	**2.5 (5)**	**1.5 (3)**	2 (4)	
Junior	77.4 (120)	15.5 (24)	1.9 (3)	1.3 (2)	3.9 (6)	
Senior	**80.8 (215)**	13.5 (36)	1.9 (5)	**1.5 (4)**	2.3 (6)	
Graduate Student	78.6 (55)	17.1 (12)	1.4 (1)	0 (0)	2.9 (2)	
How often do you "tweet"?						**68.372***
Freshman	41.9 (104)	23.8 (59)	8.9 (22)	5.2 (13)	20.2 (50)	
Sophomore	31 (62)	26.5 (53)	**12 (24)**	6 (12)	**24.5 (49)**	
Junior	48.4 (75)	22.6 (35)	9.7 (15)	**7.1 (11)**	12.3 (19)	
Senior	55.4 (149)	**26.8 (72)**	7.8 (21)	1.5 (4)	8.6 (23)	
Graduate Student	**64.3 (45)**	22.9 (16)	10 (7)	1.4 (1)	1.4 (1)	
How often do you upload pictures?						**-**
Freshman	25.8 (64)	55.2 (137)	**12.5 (31)**	3.2 (8)	**3.2 (8)**	
Sophomore	20.5 (41)	**66 (132)**	9 (18)	3.5 (7)	1 (2)	
Junior	22.6 (35)	60.6 (94)	9.7 (15)	**3.9 (6)**	**3.2 (5)**	
Senior	25.3 (68)	61 (164)	8.9 (24)	3.3 (9)	1.5 (4)	
Graduate Student	**31.9 (22)**	62.3 (43)	5.8 (4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	
How often do you post a status update on Facebook?						**-**
Freshman	**55.6 (138)**	35.5 (88)	5.6 (14)	1.2 (3)	2 (5)	
Sophomore	47 (94)	42 (84)	6.5 (13)	2.5 (5)	2 (4)	
Junior	43.2 (67)	48.4 (75)	4.5 (7)	1.9 (3)	1.9 (3)	
Senior	45.7 (123)	42.8 (115)	4.5 (12)	**4.1 (11)**	**3 (8)**	
Graduate Student	37.1 (26)	**52.9 (37)**	**8.6 (6)**	1.4 (1)	0 (0)	

*$p < .001$

Conclusion

In summary, three of the four hypotheses were supported. When traditionally stalked, a stranger was the most prevalent victim-offender relationship and for cyberstalking an ex-intimate partner was the most prevalent victim-offender relationship. Similar to the research literature,

few to no students indicated that they reported their traditional or cyberstalking victimization to law enforcement. However, if the stalking victimization was reported, it was most common for the student to tell a friend or family member. Also, in line with the current research and trends, more incidents of cyberstalking victimization than traditional stalking victimization was reported by students. Last, female students appeared to cyberstalk at a higher rate than male students, especially for cases involving how often the student visited another non-intimate partner's Facebook page. Yet, this relationship was weak. Although no substantive relationship was found, it appeared that freshmen and sophomores were more inclined to use Twitter as a social media outlet instead of Facebook, and uploading pictures was a very common activity among students at each grade level.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Stalking literature has shown that online victimization has become more widespread, and with this known, the ways in which it can occur must be routinely examined as new methods and devices continue to develop and change. While traditional stalking and cyberstalking behaviors have been researched both separately and jointly, there has not been a clear and concise way of conceptualizing and operationalizing the behaviors (Alexy et al., 2005; Baum, et al., 2009; Goodno, 2007; King-Ries, 2010; Miller, 2012; Nobles et al., 2012; Reyns, & Englebrecht, 2012; Roberts, 2008; Simizu, 2013; Vasiu, & Vasiu, 2013). This could be due to the advancements in technology and the increase use in every day society. In today's society, it would be difficult to define any behavior without also addressing the ways in which technology could complete or enhance that behavior. Therefore, all aspects of criminal activity, especially those highlighted in regards to stalking, should be continually researched.

In this study, there were four proposed hypotheses, which involved examining the victim-offender relationship for both traditional and cyberstalking behaviors, the reporting of stalking behaviors to law enforcement, the prevalence of traditional and cyberstalking behaviors, and gender relations to cyber offending. Overall, three of the four hypotheses were supported. Nonetheless, there were several key findings in this study that should be examined more carefully.

First, when examining the victim-offender relationship, the current research reflected that strangers were more likely to partake in traditional stalking instead of an ex-friend as proposed in the first hypothesis. For example, students indicated that they were physically watched by a stranger from a distance and physically followed by strangers. This was particularly alarming.

This finding could have been a result of students noticing someone unknown to them looking their direction in a public setting. When the individual caught a stranger looking at them from afar, it may not have been with malicious intent but instead for social cues on how to act in a particular public setting. As for cyberstalking incidents, an ex-intimate partner was the most common victim-offender relationship reported by college students. It is pure speculation, but here, it may be possible that ex-intimate partners may have found other means by which they can repeatedly pursue an individual, especially through social media outlets such as Twitter or Facebook.

Second, when cyberstalked or traditionally stalked, students were less likely to report the incident to law enforcement. Instead, students turned to those closest to them-friends and family members. This finding is supported in various research studies (Buhi et al., 2008; Jordan et al., 2007; McNamara & Marsil, 2012; Scott et al., 2014). This finding lends itself to a very important policy implication on college campuses and falls in line with previous research that most incidents are underreported. For instance, college campuses need to incorporate programs to inform students about how to report stalking incidents. Specifically, these services should be aimed at guiding individuals with knowledge of what to do when their friend and/or family member come to them with reports of stalking behaviors. While both traditional and cyberstalking incidents should be addressed, there should be a greater emphasis on cyberstalking behaviors because it was found in the study that these behaviors were reported more often. However, most police departments do not have the specific computer training needed to investigate computer crimes (King-Ries, 2010).

A potential model that could be used is the online interactive video created by the National White Collar Crime Center (NW3C, 2015) titled, “Cyberbullying: Our Children, Our

Problem." This video was created to address the issue of cyberbullying among adolescents. Such cyberstalking educational services can be implemented during college orientations since the majority of stalking victims are of college age. However, the educational services should also be provided for the parents of younger generations as well. Informational sessions could be held at a high school, for example. By providing the information to those caring for younger generations it could address the underlying issues accompanied with the increase use of technology by younger generations. There are online classes that directly address cyberstalking; however, access to such programs is greatly limited and not as interactive as the one created for cyber bullying. Granted, such a program would be beneficial to friends and family members; however, still little is known from the research about why the incident it not reported in the first place. Educational programs help only to address the issue of how incidents are to be reported, but if there are other reasons, such as the victim does not feel completely threatened or if the victim feels embarrassed, then a program such as this one will not increase the reporting rate to law enforcement in the end.

Third, incidents of cyberstalking were more prevalent than traditional stalking. This supports the idea that technology usage is increasing in the aspect of stalking; therefore, the use of technology to commit crimes should be highly monitored. Monitoring of such technology should be completed through the use of privacy settings provided from the social media sites themselves, as well as, further education on the dangers of social media. Additional education programs could be something as simple as an informational lecture similar to those conducted for the dangers of drinking and driving provided at the high school level. While some might think that the dangers of social media sites are known, cyberstalking appears to be increasing, so this kind of information could greatly help those unsure if the behaviors they are experiencing constitute cyberstalking, and if so, how they can report the offense.

Last, females participated in higher rates of cyberstalking than males. This contradicts the literature of traditional stalking, but supports Tokunage's (2011) idea that perhaps the increase of technology is shifting the gender roles in the cyber world. However, the finding in this study must be interpreted with caution. While overall females seemed to visit their ex-intimate partner's Facebook page and current intimate partner's Facebook page, the only finding to be statistically significant was where females were more likely to visit a non-intimate or non-ex-intimate partner's Facebook page. In addition, even here, this finding was not substantively significant. At the same time, this finding should not be discounted altogether. The computer provides a shield and a sense of anonymity that may give females a newfound sense of empowerment. In the end, further study is warranted.

Additional analyses concluded that the use of Twitter appears to be more common among the underclassmen, while upperclassmen seemed to use Facebook more often. While this finding was neither statistically nor substantively significant, it lends support to the idea of continually researching the various social networking sites. For instance, in this study, students were asked to list the various social media outlets they currently used, common responses (other than Facebook or Twitter) were sites such as Yik Yak, Instagram, and SnapChat. Although this study did include an "other" section in terms of media outlets used to conduct the stalking behaviors, the overall study is limited by not fully expanding upon the various cyberstalking behaviors that occur within a college setting. Therefore, research on the various social media networking sites must be kept as current as possible in order to maintain an idea of how criminal activity, namely that of cyberstalking, is being conducted.

There were several limitations in this study that should be addressed for future research. One limitation was the level of measurement used to measure incidents of traditional and

cyberstalking. That is, nominal and ordinal level measures do not provide the opportunity to explore causal relationships to the fullest extent. This would allow the researcher to use other statistical tests besides chi-square that are not as sensitive to sample size (or observed and expected frequencies). In addition, researchers should also be sure to clearly and thoroughly direct participants as to the objective of the study. In this study, for example, it seemed that participants were either unclear of the directions (i.e., that the relationship was to pertain to the most recent described behavior) or that they did not understand the definitions provided for the various relationships. Furthermore, questions asked about cyberstalking should capture the most current social networking sites or should have an open response as to the social networking site associated with each cyberstalking behavior.

In brief, the primary purpose of this study was to examine the victim-offender relationship as well as the prevalence of traditional stalking and cyberstalking on a college campus. It was concluded that cyberstalking was found to be more prevalent on the college campus, and the victim-offender relationship most prevalent among these behaviors was that of ex-intimate partners. This may infer that individuals have found another way to repeatedly pursue their ex-intimate partners, even if those ex-intimate partners are no longer in physical proximity (i.e., moving away to college) to them. An example of this can be seen through the use social media outlets to monitor their ex-intimate partners. This idea should be further examined in future research studies.

REFERENCES

Alexy, E. M., Burgess, A. W., Baker, T., & Smoyak S. A. (2005). Perceptions of cyberstalking among college students. *Brief Treatment and Crisis Intervention, 5*(3), 279-289. doi: 10.1093/brieftreatment/mhi020

Bachman, R., & Schutt, R. K. (2014). *The practice of research in criminology and criminal justice* (5th Ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Baughman, L. L. (2010). Friend or foe? Confirming the misuse of internet and social networking sites by domestic violence perpetrators. *Widener Law Journal, 19*, 933-964.

Baum, K., Catalano, S., Rand, M., & Rose, K. (2009). Stalking victimization in the United States. *Bureau of Justice Statistics: Special Report*, 1- 16.

Basile, K. C., Swahn, M. H., Chen, J., & Saltzman, L. E. (2006). Stalking in the United States recent national prevalence estimates. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 31*(2), 172-175. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2006.03.028

Basu, S., & Jones, R. (2007). Regulating cyberstalking. *Journal of Information, Law and Technology, 2*, 1-30. Retrieved from: http://go.warwick.ac.uk/jilt/2007_2/basu_jones/

Björklund, K., Häkkänen-Nyholm, H., Sheridan, L., & Roberts, K. (2010). The prevalence of stalking among Finnish university students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*(4), 684-698. doi: 10.1177/0886260509334405

Blaauw, E., Winkel, F. W., Arensman, E., Sheridan, L., & Freeve, A. (2002). The toll of stalking. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*(1), 50-63. doi: 10.1177/0886260502017001004

Bossler, A. M., Holt, T. J., & May, D. C. (2012). Predicting online harassment victimization among a juvenile population. *Youth & Society, 44*(4), 500-523. doi: 10.1177/0044118X11407525

Buhi, E. R., Clayton, H., & Surrency, H. H. (2008). Stalking victimization among college women and subsequent help-seeking behaviors. *Journal of American College Health, 57*(4), 419-425.

Campbell, J., & Moore, R. (2011). Self-perceptions of stalking victimization and impacts on victim reporting. *Police Practice and Research, 12*(6), 506-517. doi: 10.1080/15614263.2011

Cass, A. I., & Rosay, A. B. (2012). College student perceptions of criminal justice system responses to stalking. *Sex Roles, 66*, 392-404. doi: 10.1007/s11199-011-9934-3

Catalano, S. (2012). Stalking victims in the United States-Revised. *Bureau of Justice Statistics.* Retrieved from: http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/svus_rev.pdf

Center for Disease Control and Prevention. (2014). Prevalence and characteristics of sexual violence, stalking, and intimate partner violence victimization- National intimate partner and sexual violence survey, United States, 2011. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, 63*(8), 1-18.

Chaulk, K., & Jones, T. (2011). Online obsessive relational intrusion: Further concerns about Facebook. *Journal of Family Violence, 26*, 245-254. doi: 10.1007/s10896-011-9360-x

Cohen L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activities approach. *American Sociological Review, 44*(4), 588-608.

Coleman, F. L. (1997). Stalking behavior and the cycle of domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12*, 420-432. doi: 10.1177/088626097012003007.

Cullen, F. T., & Agnew, R. (2011). *Criminological theory: Past to present* (4th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Davis, K. E., Swan, S. C., & Gambone, L. J. (2012). Why doesn't he just leave me alone? Persistent pursuit: A critical review of theories and evidence. *Sex Roles, 66*, 328-339. doi: 10.1007/s11199-010-9882-3

DeBing, H., Bailer, J., Anders, A., Wagner, H., & Gallas, C. (2014). Cyberstalking in a large sample of social network users: Prevalence, characteristics, and impact upon victims. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 17*(2), 61-67. doi: 10.1089/cyber.2012.0231

De Fazio, L. (2011). Criminalization of stalking in Italy: One of the last among current European member states' anti-stalking laws. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 29*, 317-323. doi: 10.1002/bsl.

De Smet, O., Loeys, T., & Buysse, A. (2012). Post-breakup unwanted pursuit: A refined analysis of the role of romantic relationship characteristics. *Journal of Family Violence, 27*, 437-452. doi: 10.1007/s10896-012-9437-1

Duntley, J. D., & Buss, D. M. (2012). The evolution of stalking. *Sex Roles, 66*, 311-327. doi: 10.1007/s11199-010-9832-0

Dutton, L. B., & Winstead, B. A. (2011). Types, frequency, and effectiveness of responses to unwanted pursuit and stalking. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*(6), 1129-1156. doi: 10.1177/0886260510368153

Facebook, Inc. (2015). Company information. Retrieved from: http://newsroom.fb.com/company-info/

Ferreira, C., & Matos, M. (2013). Post-relationship stalking: The experience of victims with and without history of partner abuse. *Journal of Family Violence, 28*, 393-402. doi: 10.1007/s10896-013-9501-5

Fox, K. A., Nobles, M. R., & Akers, R. L. (2011). Is stalking a learned phenomenon? An empirical test of social learning theory. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 39*, 39-47. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.10.002

Ga. Code Ann. §16-5-91 (2014).

Gau, J. M. (2015). *Statistics for criminology and criminal justice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Goodno, N. H. (2007). Cyberstalking, a new crime: Evaluating the effectiveness of current state and federal laws. *Missouri Law Review, 72*(1), 125-197.

Gordon, S., & Ford, R. (2006). On definition and classification of cybercrime. *Journal in Computer Virology, 2*, 13-20. doi:10.1007/s11416-006-0015-z

Gross, L., (2012). *Surviving a stalker* (4th ed.). Bend, OR: Incubation Press.

Gover, A. R., Kaukinen, C., & Fox, K. A. (2008). The relationship between violence in the family of origin and dating violence among college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 23*(12), 1667-1693. doi: 10.1177/0886260508314330

Gowland, J. (2013). Protection from Harassment Act of 1997: The 'new' stalking offenses. *The Journal of Criminal Law, 77*, 387-398. doi: 10.1350/jcla.2013.77.5.865

Harvey, D. (2003). Cyberstalking and internet harassment: What the law can do. *NetSafe II: Society, Safety and the Internet Conference Proceeding, 18*(04), 1-19.

Holt, T. J., & Bossler, A. M. (2009). Examining the applicability of lifestyle-routine activities theory for cybercrime victimization. *Deviant Behavior, 30*(1), 1-25.

Jacoby, J. E. (2012). (Ed.). *Classics of criminology* (4th ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Jennings, W. G., Park, M., Tomsich, E. A., Gover, A. R., & Akers, R. L. (2011). Assessing the overlap in dating violence perpetration and victimization among South Korean college students: The influence of social learning and self-control. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 36*, 188-206. doi: 10.1007/s12103-011-9110-x

Joinson, A. N. (2008). Looking at, looking up or keeping up with people? Motives and use of Facebook. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1027-1036.

Jordon, C. E., Wilcox, P., & Pritchard, A. J. (2007). Stalking acknowledgement and reporting among college women experiencing intrusive behaviors: Implications for the emergence of a "classical stalking case". *Journal of Criminal Justice, 35*, 556-569. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2007.07.008

KY Rev. Stat. Ann. §508.130 (LexisNexis 2014)

King-Ries, A. (2010). Teens, technology, and cyberstalking: The domestic violence wave of the future? *Texas Journal of Women and the Law, 20*(2), 131-164.

Kropp, P. R., Hart, S. D., Lyon, D. R., & Storey, J. E. (2011). The development and validation of the guidelines for stalking assessment and management. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 29*, 302-316. doi: 10.1002/bsl.978

Lab, S.P. (2010). *Crime prevention: Approaches, practices and evaluations.* (7th ed.). New Providence, NJ: Matthew Bender & Company, Inc.

Lenhart, A., Purcell, K., Smith, A., & Zickuhr, K. (2010). Social media & mobile internet use among teens and young adults. *Pew Internet & American Life Project,* 1-51.

Lipton, J. D. (2011). Combating cyber-victimization. *Berkeley Technology Law Journal, 26*, 1103-1155.

Loftin, C., Kindely, K., Norris, S. L., & Wiersema, B. (1987). An attribute approach to relationships between offenders and victims in homicide. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 78*(2), 259-271. doi: 0091-4169/87/7802-259

Logan, T. (2010). Research on partner stalking: Putting the pieces together. *National Institute of Justice.*

Logan, T., & Walker, R. (2009). Partner stalking psychological dominance or "business as usual"? *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 10*(3), 247-270. doi: 10.1177/1524838009334461

Lyndon, A., Bonds-Raacke, J., & Cratty, A. (2011). College students' Facebook stalking of ex-partners. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 14*, 711-716. doi: 10.1089/cyber.2010.0588

Marshall University. (2013). *Major headcount and fte fall semesters 2011-12 through 2012-13.* Retrieved from: https://www.marshall.edu/irp/Bluebook%202013 2014/hdct_fall_class_mu_f13.pdf

Ménard, K. S., & Pincus, A. L. (2012). Predicting overt and cyberstalking perpetration by male and female college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(11), 2183-2207. doi: 10.1177/0886260511432144

McCormick, L. (2014). The internet and social media sites: A shift in privacy norms resulting in the exploitation and abuse of adolescents and teens in dating relationships. *Albany Government Law Review, 591*(7), 1-21.

McEwan, T. E., MacKenzie, R. D., Mullen, P. E., & James, D. V. (2012). Approach and escalation in stalking. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology, 23*(3), 392-409.

McNamara, C. L., & Marsil, D. F. (2012). The prevalence of stalking among college students: The disparity between researcher-and self-identified victimization. *Journal of American College Health, 60*(2), 168-173.

Miller, L. (2012). Stalking: Patterns, motives, and intervention strategies. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 17,* 495-506. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2012.07.001

Mohandie, K., Meloy, J. R., McGown, M. G., & Williams, J. (2006). The RECON typology of stalking: Reliability and validity based upon a large sample of North American stalkers, *Journal of Forensic Science, 51*(1), 147- 155. doi: 10.1111/j.1556-4029.2005.00030.x

National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. (2010). *National intimate partner and sexual violence survey.* Retrieved from: http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention /nisvs /2010 _ report.html

National Center for Victims of Crime. (2012). *Stalking Resource Center*. Retrieved from: http://www.victimsofcrime.org/our-programs/stalking-resource-center

National Center for Victims of Crime. (2007). *The Model Stalking Code Revisited.* Retrieved from: http://www.victimsofcrime.org/docs/src/model-stalking-code.pdf?sfvrsn=0

National Conference of State Legislation. (2015). *State cyberstalking and cyberharassment laws.* Retrieved from; http://www.ncsl.org/research/telecommunications-and-information-technology/cyberstalking-and-cyberharassment-laws.aspx#laws

National Conference of State Legislation. (2013). *State cyberstalking and cyberharassment laws.* Retrieved from: http://ncsl.org/issues-research/telecom/cyberstalking-and-cyberharassment-laws.aspx

National White Collar Crime Center. (2015). *Cyberbullying: Our children, our problem*. NW3C, Inc. Retrieved from: http://www.nw3c.org/training/online-training/105

National White Collar Crime Center. (2013). *Cyberstalking.* NW3C, Inc. Retrieved from: http://www.nw3c.org/docs/research/cyberstalking

National White Collar Crime Center. (2015). *Cyberstalking.* NW3C, Inc. Retrieved from: http://www.nw3c.org/docs/research/cyberstalking.pdf?sfvrsn=8

Navarro, J. N., & Jasinski, J. L. (2011). Going cyber: Using routine activities theory to predict cyberbullying experiences. *Sociological Spectrum, 31*(1), 81-94. doi: 10.1080/02732173.2012.628560

New Hampshire v. Craig. 2013-229 N.H. LEXIS 13 (2015).

New Mexico v. Richart. 30,143 N.M. App. Unpub. LEXIS 104 (2011).

Ngo, F.T. (2014). Towards a comprehensive model on stalking acknowledgment: A test of four models. *Crime and Delinquency, 60*(8), 1158-1182. doi: 10.1177/0011128711428731

Ngo, F. T., & Paternoster, R. (2013). Stalking, gender, and coping strategies: A partial test of Broidy and Agnew's gender/general strain theory hypotheses. *Victims and Offenders: An International Journal of Evidence-based Research, Policy, and Practice, 8*(1), 94-117. doi: 10.1080/15564886.2012.749122

Nobles, M. R., & Fox, K. A. (2013). Assessing stalking behaviors in a control balance theory framework. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 40*(7), 737-762. doi: 10.1177/0093854813475346

Nobles, M. R., Reyns, B. W., Fox, K. A., & Fisher, B. S. (2012). Protection against pursuit: A conceptual and empirical comparison of cyberstalking and stalking victimization among a national sample. *Justice Quarterly.* 1-19. doi: 10.1080/07418825.2012.723030

Ohio Rev. Code Ann. §2903.211 (LexisNexis 2015).

Patton, C. L., Nobles, M. R., & Fox, K. A. (2010). Look who's stalking who: Obsessive pursuit and attachment bond. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 38,* 282-290. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.02.013

Payne, B. K., & Chappell, A. (2008). Using student samples in criminological research. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 2*(19), 175-192. doi: 10.1080/10511250802137226

Potter, S. J. (2012). Using a multimedia social marketing campaign to increase active bystanders on the college campus. *Journal of American College Health, 60*(4), 282-295.

Reyns, B. W., & Englebrecht, C. M. (2012). The fear factor: Exploring predictors of fear among stalking victims throughout the stalking encounter. *Crime & Delinquency, 59*(5), 788-808. doi: 10.1177/0011128712461123

Reyns, B. W., & Englebrecht, C. M. (2010). The stalking victim's decision to contact the police: A test of Gottfredson and Gottfredson's theory of criminal justice decision making. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 38,* 998-1005. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.07.001

Reyns, B. W., Henson, B., & Fisher, B. S. (2011). Being pursued online: Applying cyberlifestyle-routine activities theory to cyberstalking victimization. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 38*(11), 1149-1169. doi: 10.1177/0093854811421448

Reyns, B. W., Henson, B., & Fisher, B. S. (2012). Stalking in the twilight zone: Extent of cyberstalking victimization and offending among college students. *Deviant Behavior, 33,* 1-25. doi: 10.1080/01639625.2010.538364

Roberts, L. (2008). Jurisdictional and definitional concerns with computer-mediated interpersonal crimes: An analysis on cyberstalking. *International Journal of Cyber Criminology, 2*(1), 271-285.

Salter, M., & Bryden, C. (2009). I can see you: Harassment and stalking on the internet. *Information & Communications Technology Law, 18*(2), 99-122. doi: 10.1080/13600830902812800

Scott, A. J., Rajakaruna, N., & Sheridan, L. (2014). Framing and perceptions of stalking: The influence of conduct severity and the perpetrator-target relationship. *Psychology, Crime, & Law, 20*(3), 242-260. doi: 10.1080/1068316X.2013.770856

Sheridan, L. P., & Grant, T. (2007). Is cyberstalking different? *Psychology, Crime & Law, 13*(6), 1-14. doi: 10.1080/10683160701340528

Shimizu, A. (2013). Recent developments domestic violence in the digital age: Towards the creation of a comprehensive cyberstalking statute. *Berkeley Journal of Gender, Law & Justice, 28*(1), 116-137.

Sinclair, H. C. (2012) Stalking myth-attributions: Examining the role of individual and contextual variables on attributions in unwanted pursuit scenarios. *Sex Roles, 66*, 378-391. doi: 10.1007/s11199-010-9853-8

Storey, J. E., & Hart, S. D. (2011). How do police respond to stalking? An examination of the risk management strategies and tactics used in a special anti-stalking law enforcement unit. *Journal of Police and Crime Psychology, 26*, 128-142. doi: 10.1007/s11896-010-9081-8

Thapa, A., & Kumar, R. (2011). Cyber staking: Crime and challenge at the cyberspace. *International Journal of Computing and Business Research, 2*(1), 340-354.

Theriot, M. T. (2010). Conceptual and methodological considerations for assessment and prevention of adolescent dating violence and stalking at school. *Children & Schools, 30*(4), 223-233.

Tokunaga, R. S. (2011). Social networking site or social surveillance site? Understanding the use of interpersonal electronic surveillance in romantic relationships. *Computers in Human Behavior, 27,* 705-713 doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2010.08.014

Towns, A. J., & Scott, H. (2013). 'I couldn't even dress the way I wanted.' Young women talk of 'ownership' by boyfriends: An opportunity for the prevention of domestic violence? *Feminism & Psychology, 23*(4), 536-555. doi: 10.1177/0959353513481955

Tong, S. T., & Walther, J. B. (2011). Facebook and relationship termination: Connection, isolation, and stalking. *Relationships and the Internet*. Symposium presented at the Oxford Internet Institute.

Tjaden, P. G. (2009). Stalking policies and research in the United States: A twenty year retrospective. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research, 15*(3), 261-278. doi: 10.1007/s101610-009-9100-4

Twitter, Inc. (2015). Company information. Retrieved from: https://about.twitter.com/company

United States Census Bureau (2012). Information and communications. *Statistical Abstract of the United States.* Retrieved from: https://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/2012/tables/12s1149.pdf

United States Census Bureau (2012). *Measuring America*. Retrieved from: https://www.census.gov/hhes/computer/publications/2012.html

United States Code. Title 18, Part I, Chapter 110A. § 2261A. (Amended 2013).

United States v. Cassidy, 814 F. Supp. 2 574 (D.C. District of Maryland 2011).

Vaidya, G., Chalhoub, N., & Newing, J. (2005). Stalking in adolescence: A case report. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health, 10*(1), 23-25.

Vasiu, I., & Vasiu, L. (2013). Cyberstalking nature and response recommendations. *Academic Journal of Interdiciplinary Studies, 2*(9). doi: 10.5901/ajis.2013.v2n9p229

W.Va. Code §61-2-9a (LexisNexis 2015)

Weller, M., Hope, L., & Sheridan, L. (2013). Police and public perceptions of stalking: The role of prior victim-offender relationship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 28*(2), 320-339. doi: 10.1177/0886260512454718

Welsh, A., & Lavoie, J. A. A. (2012). Risky eBusiness: An examination of risk-taking, online disclosiveness, and cyberstalking victimization. *Cyberpsychology*: *Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace, 6*(1), 1-13. doi: 10.5817/CP2012-1-4

WHOA. (2012). *Cyberstalking statistics.* Retrieved from www.haltabuse.org.

Williams, S. L., & Frieze, I. H. (2005). Courtship behaviors, relationship violence, and breakup persistence in college men and women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 29*, 248-257.

Wilson, J. S., Ermshar, A. L., & Welsh, R. K. (2006). Stalking as paranoid attachment: A typological and dynamic model. *Attachment & Human Development, 8*(2), 139-157. doi: 10.1080/14616730600774433

Yar, M. (2005). The novelty of cybercrime: An assessment in light of routine activities theory. *European Journal of Criminology*, *2*(4), 407-427.

Zona, M. A., Sharma, K. K., & Lane, J. (1993). A comparative study of erotomanic and obsessional subjects in a forensic sample. *Journal of Forensic Science, 38*(4), 894-903

720 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 5/12-7.5 (LexisNexis 2014)

APPENDIX A

SURVEY ABOUT TRADITIONAL AND CYBERSTALKING

Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability by circling the answer. When you are finished please place the survey in the envelope in the front of the room.

Section I

In thinking about the **past school year**, <u>how many times</u> has another individual *without* your permission…						
1a	physically watched you from afar?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
1b	physically followed you?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
1c	physically spied on you?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
1d	waited for you outside your **house**?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
1e	waited for you outside your **work**?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
1f	waited for you outside your **class**?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
1g	sent unsolicited letters or emails to you?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
1h	showed up at places you mentioned you would be on Facebook or Twitter?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
1i	used Facebook or Twitter to "keep tabs" on you?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
1j	used your Facebook profile to obtain information about you?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
1k	tried adding your friends/family/coworkers to their friends list on Facebook?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
1l	began following your friends/family/coworkers on Twitter?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
1m	sent your friends/family/co-workers messages, whether it was through Facebook or basic email messages?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
1n	used other social media to follow you. Please specify (i.e., Snapchat)					

If you answered any of these questions with a number greater than zero, please continue to **Section II** on the next page. If your answers indicated that none of the behaviors in **Section I** happened to you within the past school year, please continue to **Section IV** on page 5.

For **Sections II and V** please keep the following definitions in mind:

- current intimate partner = A person with whom you have a current personal and romantic relationship that is characterized by emotional intimacy or physical and sexual intimacy.
- ex-intimate partner = A person with whom you previously shared physical or emotional intimacy and where that relationship was ended either by you, the other person, or given both of your wishes.
- current friend = A person with whom you presently share a mutual affection that is characterized by having similar interests, hanging out on a regular basis, and conversing.
- ex-friend = A person with whom you previously shared a mutual affection but no longer do you associate with this person.
- acquaintance = A person you know slightly, but who you would not categorize as a friend or ex-friend.
- stranger = A person you do not know.
- n/a = Not applicable. This behavior did not occur, so there is no relationship to report.

Section II

Following up on part one, within the **past school year**, what was the relationship of the individual who….								
2a	physically watched you from afar?	Current intimate partner	Ex-intimate partner	Current friend	Ex-friend	Acquaintance	Stranger	n/a
2b	physically followed you?	Current intimate partner	Ex-intimate partner	Current friend	Ex-friend	Acquaintance	Stranger	n/a
2c	physically spied on you?	Current intimate partner	Ex-intimate partner	Current friend	Ex-friend	Acquaintance	Stranger	n/a
2d	waited for you outside your **house** without your permission?	Current intimate partner	Ex-intimate partner	Current friend	Ex-friend	Acquaintance	Stranger	n/a
2e	waited for you outside your **work**?	Current intimate partner	Ex-intimate partner	Current friend	Ex-friend	Acquaintance	Stranger	n/a
2f	waited for you outside your **class**?	Current intimate partner	Ex-intimate partner	Current friend	Ex-friend	Acquaintance	Stranger	n/a
2g	sent you unsolicited letters or emails?	Current intimate partner	Ex-intimate partner	Current friend	Ex-friend	Acquaintance	Stranger	n/a
2h	showed up at places you mentioned you would be on Facebook or Twitter?	Current intimate partner	Ex-intimate partner	Current friend	Ex-friend	Acquaintance	Stranger	n/a
2i	used Facebook or Twitter to "keep tabs" on you?	Current intimate partner	Ex-intimate partner	Current friend	Ex-friend	Acquaintance	Stranger	n/a
2j	used your Facebook profile to obtain information about you?	Current intimate partner	Ex-intimate partner	Current friend	Ex-friend	Acquaintance	Stranger	n/a
2k	tried adding your friends/family/coworkers to their friends list on Facebook?	Current intimate partner	Ex-intimate partner	Current friend	Ex-friend	Acquaintance	Stranger	n/a
2l	began following your friends/family/coworkers on Twitter?	Current intimate partner	Ex-intimate partner	Current friend	Ex-friend	Acquaintance	Stranger	n/a
2m	sent your friends/family/coworkers messages, whether it was through Facebook or email messages?	Current intimate partner	Ex-intimate partner	Current friend	Ex-friend	Acquaintance	Stranger	n/a

Section III

*Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability as they pertain to the behaviors discussed in **Section I and Section II** by circling the answer in the box indicted.*

3a. With whom did you report these behaviors to? Circle all that apply.					
local police	campus police	friends/family member(s)	resident advisor	other: (please specify): _____	The behavior(s) were not reported.

3b. What was the relationship between you and the individual that you reported? (Please indict the relationship of the last person you reported if you have reported more than one)						
current intimate partner	ex-intimate partner	current friend	ex-friend	acquaintance	stranger	n/a did not report behaviors

If you chose not to report the behaviors please explain why.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Section IV

Thinking back upon the **past school year**, <u>how many times</u> have YOU (*without* their permission)…						
4a	physically watched another person from afar?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
4b	physically followed another person?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
4c	physically spied on another person?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
4d	waited for another person outside their **house**?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
4e	waited for another person outside their **work**?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
4f	waited for another person outside their **class**?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
4g	sent unsolicited letters or emails to another person?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
4h	showed up at places they mentioned they would be on Facebook or Twitter?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
4i	used Facebook or Twitter to "keep tabs" on another person?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
4j	used another person's Facebook profile to obtain information about them?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
4k	tried adding another person's friends/family/coworkers to your friends list on Facebook?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
4l	began following another person's friends/family/coworkers on Twitter?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
4m	sent their friends/family/co-workers messages, whether it was through Facebook or basic email messages?	0 times	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10 or more times
4n	used other social media to follow another person. Please specify (i.e., Snapchat)					

If you did not conduct *any* of the behaviors listed in **Section IV** please skip **Section V** and **Section VI** and continue to **Section VII**.

Section V

Following up on **Section IV**, what was the relationship between you and the individual who you…								
5a	Watched from afar?	current intimate partner	ex-intimate partner	current friend	ex-friend	acquaintance	stranger	n/a
5b	Followed?	current intimate partner	ex-intimate partner	current friend	ex-friend	acquaintance	stranger	n/a
5c	Spied on?	current intimate partner	ex-intimate partner	current friend	ex-friend	acquaintance	stranger	n/a
5d	Waited for outside their **house**?	current intimate partner	ex-intimate partner	current friend	ex-friend	acquaintance	stranger	n/a
5e	Waited for outside their **work**?	current intimate partner	ex-intimate partner	current friend	ex-friend	acquaintance	stranger	n/a
5f	Waited for outside their **class**?	current intimate partner	ex-intimate partner	current friend	ex-friend	acquaintance	stranger	n/a
5g	Sent unsolicited letters or emails to them?	current intimate partner	ex-intimate partner	current friend	ex-friend	acquaintance	stranger	n/a
5h	Showed up at places they mentioned they would be on Facebook or Twitter?	current intimate partner	ex-intimate partner	current friend	ex-friend	acquaintance	stranger	n/a
5i	Used Facebook or Twitter to “keep tabs” on them?	current intimate partner	ex-intimate partner	current friend	ex-friend	acquaintance	stranger	n/a
5j	Used their Facebook profile to obtain information about them?	current intimate partner	ex-intimate partner	current friend	ex-friend	acquaintance	stranger	n/a
5k	Tried adding their friends/family/coworkers to your friends list on Facebook?	current intimate partner	ex-intimate partner	current friend	ex-friend	acquaintance	stranger	n/a
5l	Began following their friends/family/coworkers on Twitter?	current intimate partner	ex-intimate partner	current friend	ex-friend	acquaintance	stranger	n/a
5m	Sent their friends/family/co-workers messages, whether it was through Facebook or basic email messages?	current intimate partner	ex-intimate partner	current friend	ex-friend	acquaintance	stranger	n/a

Section VI

*Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability as they pertain to the behaviors discussed in **Section IV** and **Section V** by circling the best response.*

6a Did the individual report any of the mentioned behaviors to:					
local police	campus police	friend(s)/family member(s)	resident advisor	other (please specify): _____	did not report behaviors

6b What was the relation between you and the individual that reported you? (Please indict the relationship of the last person that reported if you have been reported more than one)						
current intimate partner	ex-intimate partner	current friend	ex-friend	acquaintance	stranger	n/a did not report behaviors

Section VII

Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability by circling the best response.

7a	How often do you "check-in" at the places you are at on Facebook or Twitter?	0 times a week	1-3 times per week	4-6 times per week	7-9 times per week	10 or more times per week
7b	How often do you upload pictures to social media sites?	0 times a week	1-3 times per week	4-6 times per week	7-9 times per week	10 or more times per week
7c	How often do you post status updates on Facebook?	0 times a week	1-3 times per week	4-6 times per week	7-9 times per week	10 or more times per week
7d	How often do you "tweet" on Twitter?	0 times a week	1-3 times per week	4-6 times per week	7-9 times per week	10 or more times per week
7e	How often do you visit other individual's profiles (other than a current or an ex-intimate partner) on Facebook?	0 times a week	1-3 times per week	4-6 times per week	7-9 times per week	10 or more times per week
7f	How often do you visit other individual's profiles (other than a current or an ex-intimate partner) on Twitter?	0 times a week	1-3 times per week	4-6 times per week	7-9 times per week	10 or more times per week
7g	How often do you visit your current intimate partner's profile on Facebook?	0 times a week	1-3 times per week	4-6 times per week	7-9 times per week	10 or more times per week
7h	How often do you visit your current intimate partner's profile on Twitter?	0 times a week	1-3 times per week	4-6 times per week	7-9 times per week	10 or more times per week
7i	How often do you visit your ex-intimate partner's profile on Facebook?	0 times a week	1-3 times per week	4-6 times per week	7-9 times per week	10 or more times per

						week
7j	How often do you visit your ex-intimate partner's profile on Twitter?	0 times a week	1-3 times per week	4-6 times per week	7-9 times per week	10 or more times per week

Section VIII

Please choose or fill in the most appropriate response to the following question by placing an X before the most appropriate response, or by using the space provided to fill in the most appropriate response.

8a. What is your gender? _____ Male ____ Female
8b. What is your age? _____
8c. What is your major? _____
8d. What is your year in school?_____ Freshmen _____ Sophomore _____Junior _____ Senior _____ Graduate
8e. What is your race? _____

Please list the various social media accounts that you currently have (i.e., Facebook, Twitter, etc.).
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Thank you for your time, please return this survey to the envelope in the front of the room. Once again thank you and have a great day!

APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT LETTER

You are invited to participate in a research project that is part of my master's thesis. This research is designed to analyze the victim-offender relationship in regards to certain behaviors. You were randomly chosen as a representative of Marshall University students.

This survey is comprised of eight sections and should not take longer than 20 minutes to complete. If you have already completed this survey during a different course, please do not fill out the survey again. Simply return the blank survey to the envelope placed at the front of the room.

Participation is voluntary and there will be no penalty in this class or to your class standing should you choose not to participate in this research study or should you choose to discontinue participation in this survey at any time. If you choose not to participate you may return the survey blank. Also, at any time you may choose to not answer any question by simply leaving it blank. Your responses will be anonymous, so do not put your name anywhere on the questionnaire. There are no known risks involved with this study, but if you need help or want to report an incident of stalking the Marshall University Police Department's non-emergency number is 304-696-HELP (4357). For further information regarding stalking victimization you can visit www.victimsofcrime.org/our-programs/stalking-resources-center/help-for-victims.

By completing this survey and returning it you are also confirming that you are 18 years of age or older. In addition, returning the survey into the envelope at the front of the room indicates your consent for use of the answers you supply.

This research has been approved by the Marshall University Institutional Review Board. For further questions about this study you may contact either Dr. DeTardo-Bora or Paige Heinrich at (304) 696-3084 or at (304) 696-2716, respectively. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research participant you may contact the Marshall University Office of Research Integrity at (304) 696-4303.

Please keep this page for your records.

Sincerely,

Paige Heinrich
Department of Criminal Justice
One John Marshall Drive
Huntington, WV 25755-2662
(304) 696-2716

Dr. Kimberly DeTardo-Bora
Department of Criminal Justice
One John Marshall Drive
Huntington, WV 25755-2662
(304) 696-3084

APPENDIX C

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER

MARSHALL UNIVERSITY
www.marshall.edu

Office of Research Integrity
Institutional Review Board
401 11th St., Suite 1300
Huntington, WV 25701

FWA 00002704

IRB1 #00002205
IRB2 #00003206

September 4, 2014

Kim DeTardo-Bora, PhD
Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology

RE: IRBNet ID# 650803-1
At: Marshall University Institutional Review Board #2 (Social/Behavioral)

Dear Dr. DeTardo-Bora:

Protocol Title:	[650803-1] Generation iStalk: Who's not Watching You? An Examination of the Prior Relationship between Victims of Stalking and the Offenders
Expiration Date:	September 4, 2015
Site Location:	MU
Submission Type:	New Project APPROVED
Review Type:	Exempt Review

In accordance with 45CFR46.101(b)(2), the above study and informed consent were granted Exempted approval today by the Marshall University Institutional Review Board #2 (Social/Behavioral) Designee for the period of 12 months. The approval will expire September 4, 2015. A continuing review request for this study must be submitted no later than 30 days prior to the expiration date.

This study is for student Paige Heinrich.

If you have any questions, please contact the Marshall University Institutional Review Board #2 (Social/Behavioral) Coordinator Bruce Day, ThD, CIP at 304-696-4303 or day50@marshall.edu. Please include your study title and reference number in all correspondence with this office.