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Research Summary:
We provide the results of a 1997 national-level study of stalking among college women. Over an approximately seven-month period, 13.1% of the women reported being stalked. Although physical harm was not common, the incidents typically lasted two months, involved frequent contact by offenders, and prompted victims to take protective actions. Lifestyle-routine activities, prior sexual victimization, and demographic characteristics affected the risk of victimization.

Policy Implications:
Due to its prevalence, college and university administrators need to rectify their current neglect of stalking. Interventions may include educational programs, crime prevention seminars, reducing opportunities for stalking, and increasing informal and formal controls over stalkers.
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Over the past two decades, the victimization of women has emerged as a salient social and policy concern in the private and public sectors. Within criminology and related social sciences, research in this area has grown remarkably (for a summary, see Belknap and Erez, 1995; Crowell and Burgess, 1996). Even so, compared with other types of victimization and with a few notable exceptions (Coleman, 1997; Frieze et al., 2000a, 2000b;
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and risk factors of stalking remains limited. As Coleman (1997:421) observes, "the majority of information is anecdotal because little empirical research has been conducted on stalking." Echoing this view, then National Institute of Justice (NIJ) Director Jeremy Travis (1996:2) noted that "little hard data exist on the incidence of stalking"—an omission that hinders the development of prevention strategies to combat stalking. Although studies are beginning to appear (see Bjerregaard, 2000; Coleman, 1997; Frieze et al., 2000a, 2000b; Mustaine and Tewksbury, 1999; Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998), stalking victimization remains an under-researched area. In the absence of such information, developing effective policies and appropriately targeted interventions will be difficult.

To help fill this void in the literature, we report the results of a national telephone survey of a random sample of 4,446 women attending two-year and four-year colleges and universities during the 1996–1997 academic year. We furnish data on the extent of stalking victimization and the nature of the pursuit behavior(s). Because the survey included detailed questions on each stalking incident, we are able to explore the context in which stalking occurred—that is, the form, duration, intensity, and location of the stalking, the victim-offender relationship, victim injuries and reactions to the stalking, and both whether the stalking was reported and to whom. To further our understanding of the risk factors associated with being a stalking victim, we use routine activities theory to help develop a multivariate model of stalking that examines whether victimization varies by demographic and lifestyle factors. We consider the implications of these findings for stalking as an emergent policy issue potentially deserving of planned intervention on college campuses and beyond.

THE VICTIMIZATION OF FEMALE COLLEGE STUDENTS

In the wake of highly publicized, brutal murders—what Best (1990) calls "atrocities tales"—it seemed credible over the past decade to suggest that college campuses were "armed camps" (Matthews, 1993) and "dangerous" places (Smith and Fossey, 1995). The depiction of campuses as overrun by violence, however, appears to be more hyperbole than fact. Although not immune from violent victimizations—12 homicides occurred on campuses in 1996, the year covered in our study (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1997)—98% of the college campuses reporting to the FBI did not experience a murder or non-negligent manslaughter for this period. Further, a victimization survey of 3,472 undergraduate and graduate students revealed that while on campus during the current academic year, only one
of the student respondents had been robbed and only nine had experienced an aggravated assault (Fisher et al., 1998). Using official crime statistics from 416 schools, another study reported not only that violent crime on campus is much lower than for the nation in general but also that campus violent crime rates have been steadily decreasing since 1974 (Volkwein et al., 1995:656–657; see also Fernandez and Lizotte, 1995).

The existing research suggests, however, that college students, especially women, may be more at-risk for one type of victimization: sexual victimization (see Belknap and Erez, 1995; Crowell and Burgess, 1996). This finding is consistent with a lifestyle-routine activity perspective (see Cohen and Felson, 1979; Fisher et al., 1998; Hindelang et al., 1978; Schwartz and Pitts, 1995). College students converge regularly in time and space, often with minimal adult supervision, both on and off campus. Male and female students also often cohabitate in the same building (e.g., coed dormitories, cooperatives, or apartments), socially interact in the evening hours (e.g., studying, dating, attending a party or fraternity-sorority event), consume alcohol or partake in drugs together, and retreat to private settings (e.g., residence hall rooms, apartments) where there is an absence of guardianship (see Fisher et al., 1997, 1998). To the extent that men are “motivated offenders,” college women will be in numerous situations on and off campus where they are exposed to the risk of victimization (see Fisher et al., 1998; Mustaine and Tewksbury, 1999; Schwartz and Pitts, 1995). One contention of feminist scholars is that such motivated offenders are not in short supply: The hegemony of patriarchy ensures that the propensity of males to pursue sexual relationships and, if necessary, to use force against women in this pursuit is widespread (Gilbert, 1997; Messerschmidt, 1993).

Assessing the extent to which female college students are in fact sexually victimized is a daunting challenge, because estimates of victimization often hinge on a variety of methodological choices (compare Gilbert, 1997 with Koss, 1992, 1993, 1996; see also Crowell and Burgess, 1996; Fisher et al., 2000, Lynch, 1995). Even so, there is evidence that a substantial proportion of college women experience minor forms of sexual harassment such as sexist comments (Adams et al., 1983; Lott et al., 1982). Research on sexual assaults—ranging from unwanted touching to attempted rape—report victimization levels of upwards of 30% (DeKeseredy and Kelly, 1993; Koss et al., 1987). And studies reveal that during their time in college, between 8% and 15% of women are victims of forced sexual intercourse (DeKeseredy and Keity, 1993; Gilbert, 1997; Koss et al., 1987; Rivera and Regoli, 1987; Ward et al., 1991). It also is instructive that using National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) methodology in a survey of college students, Fisher et al. (1998) found that the rate of rape victimization in their sample of college students was approximately three times higher than that reported for the 1993 NCVS general population of the
same age; the rate of sexual assault in their sample was nine times higher. Much of this victimization, moreover, occurs in the process of dating relationships (Aizenman and Kelley, 1988; DeKeseredy and Kelly, 1993; Muchlenhard and Linton, 1987).

These observations would suggest that similar to other forms of sexual or gender-based victimization, female college students would experience comparatively high rates of stalking. Again, to the extent that college campuses provide a domain in which young women interact extensively with young men, it is plausible to expect that female students would be at risk to become objects of stalking by men. Unfortunately, the major studies of sexual victimization among college students have not measured and thus have been unable to present data on the prevalence of stalking (see, e.g., DeKeseredy and Kelly, 1993; Koss et al., 1987), in part, perhaps, because sustained interest in stalking is a relatively recent occurrence.

RESEARCH ON THE EXTENT AND NATURE OF STALKING

Statistics on the number of stalking victims as well as on the number of stalkers are limited at best. At the national-level, neither the Federal Bureau of Investigation nor the NCVS collects information about stalking incidents. Likewise, state-level statistics on the number of people charged, prosecuted, or convicted of stalking are not readily available. According to the NIJ’s 1996 VAWA report to Congress, however, estimates of the number of stalkers in the United States vary widely from 20,000 to 200,000. Assuming that a perpetrator stalks only one female victim, a rough estimate of the number of women stalked would range from 19.78 per 100,000 women 18 years and older to 197.79 per 100,000 women 18 years and older. Although useful, these statistics estimating the number of stalkers furnish only preliminary insights on the extent of stalking victimization and offer no information on either the nature of stalking behaviors or who is most at risk of being a stalking victim.

A small, yet growing, body of research, however, has recently appeared that provides more data on these issues (see Frieze et al., 2000a, 2000b).

---

1. We categorize stalking as a form of “sexual” victimization because it is largely conduct that involves the obsessive behavior of men toward women on the basis of their gender. We also suspect that stalking involves a desire for contact, intimacy, or sexual relations. We recognize, however, that a variety of motives can underlie stalking (see, e.g., Holmes, 1993; Meloy, 1996). Of course, this can also be said of other forms of behavior typically categorized as sexual victimization, such as sexual harassment and rape (e.g., the desire to control or exert power over women). Finally, because the definition of stalking usually includes either being physically threatened or fearing for one’s safety, stalking has been conceived as a crime of violence against women (Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998).
Based on a survey of 141 female students in undergraduate psychology classes, Coleman (1997) reports that 29.1% of the sample answered “yes” to the question, “Have you ever ended a relationship that resulted in your former partner giving you repeated, unwanted attention following the breakup?” Based on additional questions modeled after Florida’s anti-stalking statues, 9.2% of the students stated that this repeated attention was either malicious, physically threatening, or fear inducing. The limitations of this study are clear: the use of a small, unrepresentative sample; the lack of a reference period on the response; and the failure to measure stalking by men other than former boyfriends or partners. Still, the general finding that almost three in ten women have received “repeated, unwanted attention” and almost one in ten have experienced attention that threatens their safety is, at the very least, suggestive that stalking is not uncommon. Coleman’s results also provide information about the demographic profile of the stalking victim: white, early 20s (mean age, 23 years old), a father whose level of education is “some college or more,” and a mother whose level of education is “high school or less.”

Similar findings are reported by Fremouw et al., (1996). They asked two samples of undergraduate women enrolled in psychology classes at West Virginia University whether they had “ever” been stalked. Consistent with state law, they defined stalking to the respondents as “having someone knowingly and repeatedly following, harassing, or threatening you” (p. 667). Across the two samples, 26.6% and 35.2% of the females, respectively, responded that they had been stalked (30.7% overall). Fremouw et al. note that about four in five women knew their stalkers; over 40% had “seriously dated” them. Most often, women attempted to cope with the stalking by ignoring the stalker and hanging up on telephone calls. Other common coping strategies included “confronting the stalker” and “changing their schedule in order to avoid the stalker.” “Involving the police and magistrate courts,” in contrast, “were the least used strategies” (p. 668). Again, although illuminating, this research is limited by the use of the convenience samples and by the use of a lifetime (“ever”) measure of stalking as opposed to a measure with a defined reference period on the response (e.g., “since school began”) (see also Westrup and Fremouw, 1998).

Using a volunteer sample of 84 women who were enrolled in an introductory communications class at a medium-sized southeastern university, Logan et al. (2000) report results similar to Fremouw and his colleagues. Logan et al. asked respondents how many times they had experienced any of the 26 stalking behaviors following the difficult breakup of a relationship with an intimate partner. Their results indicate that 29% of the college women reported being stalked after a difficult breakup, and of these
women, 63% reported at least one threatening behavior (e.g., the perpetrator attempted to harm the respondent, threatened to harm the respondent, attempted to break into the respondent’s home). Although the results of this study contribute to our understanding of the relationship between stalking and intimate partner violence, the limitations to this study are obvious—the use of a convenience sample and a broad measure of stalking that goes beyond legal definitions of stalking and includes behaviors that may be considered as crimes separate from stalking (e.g., breaking into a home, stealing mail).

In one of the most extensive studies to date, Mustaine and Tewksbury (1999) present the results from a victimization survey, conducted in the Fall of 1996, of 861 women drawn from introductory sociology and criminal justice courses at nine post-secondary institutions. Using a six-month reference period, they report that 10.5% of the females in their sample said that they had been a victim of behavior that the women defined as “stalking.” These findings are important—especially in showing that one in ten women were stalked in a six-month period—but they can potentially be criticized for allowing respondents to define for themselves whether they had been a victim of “stalking.” Without a clear behavioral or legal description of what constitutes stalking (cf. Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998), it is possible that the respondents might have differentially interpreted whether a stalking incident had actually taken place. Conservative critics, in particular, argue that the use of imprecise offense definitions and measures artificially inflate sexual victimization rates (Gilbert, 1997).

In another advance in the research, Bjerregaard (2000) surveyed 512 women in randomly selected classrooms at a large public university in the southeast (she also surveyed 276 males). Students were “asked if they had ever been a victim of stalking” and “were provided with a general definition of stalking” (which, unfortunately, is not listed in the article) (p. 394). This study is limited by the use of a single institution, by the use of an open-ended (“ever stalked”) reference period, and by the failure to consider that respondents can be repeat victims of stalking. Even so, it is instructive that Bjerregaard found that 24.7% of the female respondents had ever been a stalking victim, with 5.7% of the victim group (not the of the entire sample) reporting they were currently being stalked. Bjerregaard also collected fairly extensive information on characteristics of the stalkings. She found, for example, that the stalking endured an average of 83.4 days, that most victims knew their stalkers, that various means of stalking were employed (e.g., phone, mail, in-person contact), that 23.8% of the women were threatened with physical violence, and that about two-thirds of the stalkings were not reported to the police.
To date, the most rigorous study of stalking remains Tjaden and Thoennes's (1998) survey in 1995-1996 of 8,000 women ages 18 and over. They report that 8% of the women had been stalked at least once in their lives. The prevalence for the preceding 12 months was 1.0%. These results, however, were conditioned by how stalking was defined in the study. To count as a stalking victim, a respondent had to (1) answer “yes” to one of eight “screen” questions that described stalking behavior, such as a person spying on or making unsolicited phone calls to the respondent; (2) answer that these behaviors had happened more than once; and (3) answer that the behavior caused the respondent to feel “very frightened” or to “fear bodily harm.” This restrictive definition has an important advantage: The incidents qualifying as stalking under this definition would be crimes under the stalking statutes that states passed in the 1990s. The disadvantage is that much of the stalking that women experience is excluded from consideration. Thus, when Tjaden and Thoennes relaxed the definition to include women who felt only “somewhat” or a “little” frightened, the lifetime prevalence figure jumped from 8% to 12%, whereas the annual prevalence figure jumped from 1% to 6%. These results suggest that serious incidents of stalking are relatively rare, but that less serious incidents are far more common.

Given the focus of the present study, it is also noteworthy that Tjaden and Thoennes drew their sample through random digit dialing from residential households with a telephone in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Their study excluded all women living in institutional settings (e.g., dormitories). This means that women living in an on-campus or an off-campus dormitory/residence hall were excluded from their study. Accordingly, the results of their work cannot be generalized with confidence to college women in general and, in particular, to females residing in a dormitory/residence hall.

Tjaden and Thoennes present additional data on the victimization incidents that met their restrictive definition of stalking (and thus are more likely to be serious in nature). Thus, they found that only 23% of the victims were stalked by strangers; that less than half the victims were threatened with physical harm; that women stalked by former husbands or
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2. Tjaden and Thoennes also interviewed 8,000 men ages 18 and over. They report that 2.2% of the men had been stalked at least once in their lives; the annual prevalence was 0.4%. Both stalking estimates for the males were significantly lower than the respective estimates for females.

3. The disparity between annual (1%) and lifetime (8%) figures for the prevalence of stalking also warrants attention. Even taking into account that some women will be victimized more than once and that a single stalking incident can last a lengthy period, it is difficult to see how an annual rate of 1% could result in only 8% of the women being stalked in their lifetime.
partners were especially likely to be physically and sexually assaulted; that 55% of the women reported the stalking incidents to the police; that stalking victims were more likely than nonvictims to be concerned for their safety and to carry something for self-defense; and that 30% of the women suffered negative psychological and social consequences as a result of their stalking. Their results support those reported in a study of 100 stalking victims from a self-selected clinical sample in Australia: In 58% of the cases, the stalker made overt threats to the victim; 7% of the victims reported being sexually assaulted and 34% physically assaulted by their stalker; and the stalking experience had social (e.g., lifestyle changes) and psychological impacts (e.g., post-traumatic stress symptoms) on the victims (see Pathé and Mullen, 1997).

Finally, Tjaden and Thoennes present only a limited analysis of the factors that may increase the risk of stalking victimization. They note that stalking was more common for younger women and for American Indian/Alaska Natives and was less common for Asian women. They do not, however, report multivariate models identifying how lifestyle factors potentially affect the risk of being stalked (cf. Mustaine and Tewksbury, 1999).

Our study attempts to build on the stalking research that has only recently appeared. Similar to Tjaden and Thoennes (1998), we present data from a nationally representative sample to explore the prevalence and nature of stalking victimization. Following research by Mustaine and Tewksbury (1999), Bjerregaard (2000), and similar scholars, and consistent with calls to conduct domain-specific research (Fisher et al., 1998; Lynch, 1987; Mustaine, 1997), we focus on a social domain—females attending college—that is likely to have more pronounced levels of stalking victimization. In so doing, we develop and test several hypotheses about the risks of being stalked that are derived from the lifestyle-routine activity theory research and the current body of descriptive work. Our analyses contribute to the individual-level empirical literature assessing the explanatory and predictive power of lifestyle-routine activity theory, especially as that perspective applies to the victimization of college students (see Fisher et al., 1997, 1998).

A LIFESTYLE-Routine ACTIVITY THEORY FRAMEWORK TO UNDERSTANDING THE RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH BEING STALKED AND ITS CHARACTERISTICS

Lifestyle-routine activity theory argues that individuals who lead lifestyles or have routines that are characterized by four key factors are more
likely to be victimized than are individuals who do not lead such lifestyles or have such routines. (Cohen & Felson, 1979). These four factors include a lifestyle or routine that (1) places individuals in close physical proximity to motivated offenders, (2) frequently places individuals in risky or deviant situations that expose them to crime, (3) exposes individuals as attractive targets to the offenders, and (4) lacks capable guardianship to deter the offenders. In the general victimization literature, researchers report results that support these four key factors of lifestyle-routine activity theory as an explanation as to why certain individuals are at a greater risk of experiencing an act of violence (for an overview, see Miethe and Meier, 1994).

Within the domain of the college campus, the lifestyle-routine activity framework has also been used to explain why certain male and female college students are more at risk of violent and theft victimization, and why certain female students are more at risk for sexual violence and stalking than other students. Regardless of type of violence or sex of the sample, researchers report consistent results: Students who engage in risky lifestyles such as “partying” often, frequently drinking alcohol, and buying and taking recreational drugs are more likely to be a victim of violence than are those students who have lower levels of participation in such activities (Fisher et al., 1998; Mustaine and Tewksbury, 1999; Schwartz and Pitts, 1995).

Continuing in this tradition, we use lifestyle-routine activity theory and the results of previous general victimization and college student studies to inform our multivariate analysis. Our goal is to more fully understand the risk factors associated with being a victim of stalking and the characteristics of stalking incidents. Below, we present a discussion of how the four main elements of lifestyle-routine activity theory noted above could relate to how the lifestyle-routine activities and demographic characteristics of college women may increase their risk of being stalked and shape the nature of stalking incidents.

PROXIMITY TO MOTIVATED OFFENDERS

The onset of any predatory victimization requires that the victim and offender be in close physical proximity to each other. In the case of stalking, this could mean an initial contact between the victim and offender. This contact could be direct contact such as a formal introduction in a social setting from which some or no relationship develops. Unlike other predatory crimes, this initial close physical proximity is not a necessary condition for the crime of stalking to take place. It may be the first of many contacts that then constitute the crime of stalking.

Because stalking takes on many forms of pursuit behavior by the
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stalker, including ones in which the victim and stalker do not initially meet or even see or talk to each other, the initial contact between the stalker and victim does not have to be in close physical proximity; it could be indirect contact—visual, audio, or technological. That is, the stalker could have seen a photo image of the person, heard the person’s voice, or corresponded with the person via the postal service or e-mail. For stalking, proximity in terms of the stalker and victim could also mean that the stalker has access to where the victim is physically located. For example, a victim can be stalked via the telephone, mail service, or Internet.

Supportive of the lifestyle-routine activities arguments, researchers have repeatedly shown that people who lead lifestyles or have routines that put one in close proximity to potential offenders are at a higher risk of victimization than are those who do not (see Miethe and Meier, 1994). Following the logic of the lifestyle-routine activity research, the risk of becoming a stalking victim may be higher for individuals who engage in social or recreational activities in which they come into contact with a number of would-be stalkers. Research both on stalking and on general college student victimization adds some further insight into the proximity-to-offenders arguments that may help to hypothesize who is at-risk of being stalked while in college. First, the stalking research shows that most stalking against women is by male perpetrators—typically someone known to the victim (Fremouw et al., 1996; Logan et al., 2000; Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998) (see discussion of attractive target). Second, the general campus victimization research has shown that student-on-student violent victimization is prevalent among college students (see Fisher et al., 1998). Coupled with the lifestyle-routine activity theory, these results could have implications for the risks of stalking among college women.

While enrolled in college, women may be in several types of situations—classrooms, coed-dormitories, all-male dormitories or residences, parties, fraternity houses—where there are a large number of male students. First, in any given academic year, as part of their educational requirements to take a certain number of class hours, full-time students generally come into daily contact with many more students than do part-time students. Full-time students may be more at-risk for stalking because they may have more contact with would-be stalkers—fellow students. They may also be victim to more direct contact types of stalking because their class schedules create more set opportunities (e.g., classes on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday at 9:00 a.m., 10:00 a.m., 1:00 a.m., etc.) for a stalker to follow them, watch them from afar, and/or wait outside or inside a building.

Second, a stalking victim may also live in the same building as the stalker. Coeducational dormitories are very common on campuses. Women who live in such dormitories routinely come in contact with fellow
male students or can be seen or heard by fellow male students. As a result, these women may have a higher risk of being stalked than those women who live in an all-female dormitory or off campus.

Third, places and social events characterized by a large number of males—a fraternity house, a party sponsored by a fraternity or attended by male athletes, an all-male dormitory or residence—could bring college women in close proximity to potential stalkers. College women who frequent such contexts may be placing themselves at a higher risk of becoming a stalking victim than those who do not because they are more visible to stalkers.

Fourth, many students are required by their respective schools to reside on campus. Living on campus may provide many opportunities for a stalker to easily know and have access to the daily lifestyle-routines of the targeted victim. For example, finding out which dormitory someone lives in is not a difficult task; one can follow a person to the dormitory, look in the student telephone book, use a search engine linked to a school’s homepage, or ask friends who reside on campus. In addition, dormitories can be easily accessed: Students leave entries and exits ajar, thus creating opportunities for a stalker to gain entrance to the victim’s residence; the number of dining places are limited and have scheduled hours when food service is available; and study areas are designated and have scheduled hours when they are open. Other on-campus opportunities for a stalker to contact a victim are also readily available. For example, on-campus telephone service is typically readily available as are student telephone numbers and e-mail addresses; knowing a student’s name and spelling it correctly are the only obstacles. The cost of on-campus mail service is typically the use of a designated campus envelope.

In sum, there are many opportunities for college women to come into close physical proximity with potential stalkers. We would hypothesize that college women who have lifestyle-routines that place them in close proximity with would-be stalkers may be more at-risk of becoming a stalking victim than those who do not have such lifestyles. These types of lifestyles-routines may also provide ample opportunities to the stalker for direct and indirect contact with the victim.

EXPOSURE TO CRIME

The general victimization research reports that the risk of personal victimization is increased when persons spend more time in public places at night, especially “hot spots” such as drinking establishments (see Miethe and Meier, 1994). The college years are typically characterized by going to bars and parties where alcohol is served and illegal drugs may be available (see Fisher et al., 1997, 1998). Numerous studies document heavy patterns
of alcohol use—binge drinking—among a substantial percentage of college students (see Wechsler et al., 1999). Both the quantity and frequency of alcohol and other drug use among college students have been linked to an increased risk of personal victimization (Rivinus and Larimer, 1993; Wechsler et al., 1998). For example, Fisher et al. (1998) report that students who spend more nights on campus partying and frequently taking recreational drugs are at higher risk of becoming a victim to a violent crime than are those who did not. Schwartz and Pitts (1995:25–26) report that college women who were sexually victimized were more likely to go out drinking more often than were other women, and the former were more likely to drink more when they went out. Contrary to these results, Logan et al. (2000) found no significant relationship between different measures of alcohol use (e.g., average number of drinks, number of days drank in past month) and stalking victimization.

Arguments have been put forth that sorority membership exposes students to more opportunities for personal victimization. For example, women in sororities have more scheduled social events, especially with fraternities, that may increase their victimization risk. The research results offer mixed support for the importance of being a member of or pledge to a sorority. For example, Rivera and Regoli (1987) report that sexual victimization (e.g., rape, forced touching) was common among sorority women. Fisher et al. (1998) report that sorority women were not significantly more at-risk of being a victim of violence than were non-sorority women.

With respect to stalking, little is known about how one's exposure to crime may affect the risk of being stalked or the characteristics of the stalking. Unfortunately, Tjaden and Thoennes do not include any measures of exposure to crime in their stalking report. Only one study using a nonprobability sample of college women has examined these characteristics; Mustaine and Tewksbury (1999) report that women who drink often at home, get drunk in public, and buy illegal drugs are more likely to have been stalked than are those who do not engage in either lifestyle-routine. Their results are suggestive that the lifestyle-routine of college women may increase the risk of coming into contact with would-be stalkers.

TARGET ATTRACTIVENESS

As we have noted, a stalking requires that the offender select a victim—a suitable target. College women may be attractive targets for reasons related to the results from previous stalking victims research. First, there is a high concentration of stalking among women. As we noted, men can be victims of stalking but very much less so than women (Bjerregaard, 2000). Tjaden and Thoennes's results show that the annual estimates of
stalking for women are 2.5 times larger than those for men (1.0% compared with 0.4%). Second, the previous research suggests that stalking victims are young (Coleman, 1997; Meloy, 1996). For example, Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) report 52% of all the female stalking victims were ages 18 to 29. If stalking is primarily committed against women and is a young person’s crime, there are ample young women who are enrolled at colleges and universities who could be potential targets of stalking. According to The National Center for Education Statistics in 1995, 54% of the total 8.8 million students enrolled in colleges and universities were women. Of these nearly 4.6 million women, 71% were between the ages of 18 and 29 years old (U.S. Department of Education, 1997).

Third, most stalking incidents are characterized by the stalker and the victim knowing each other, thus making the victim an accessible target. Meloy (1996) has proposed a relational typology of three groups of victims: prior sexual intimates, prior acquaintances, and strangers. Supportive of this typology, Tjaden and Thoennes report that the stalker was typically someone that the victim knew—a spouse/ex-spouse (38%), a cohabiting partner/ex-partner (10%), date/former date (14%), relative (4%), or an acquaintance (19%). Only 23 of the victims reported that the stalker was a stranger.4 Third, typically, the stalking victim had been involved in a sexually intimate relationship with the stalker, with the stalking usually occurring after the relationship has ended (see Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2000). For example, Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) reported that 59% of the female victims were stalked by some type of intimate partner. They found that 43% of the stalking victims reported that the stalking occurred after the relationship ended and 36% reported that the stalking happened both before and after the relationship ended. Hall’s (1998) nonrandom sample of self-defined stalking victims supports Tjaden and Thoennes’s relationship finding. Hall’s sample reported that 57% of the stalkers were “post-intimate” relationship stalkers.

For many young women, the college years are a time when they date one or more persons in hopes of establishing an intimate relationship. For some, dating or being in an intimate relationship may also lead to being a victim of violence. Researchers report consistent results: Rape, and other forms of violence (e.g., hitting, slapping) and unwanted sexual activity (e.g., touching genitals) are common among college students. Concerning the victim-offender relationship, there is a consensus among the studies: In the majority of these types of incidents, the perpetrator is known to the victim and, indeed, usually is the victim’s date or an acquaintance (see Harney and Muehlenhard, 1991; Koss et al., 1987). Even those college
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4. The percentages exceed 100% because some victims had more than one stalker.
women who are involved in a "committed" relationship (but not married) have a significant risk of being sexually victimized with force by their partner (Fisher et al., 2000).

Recently, several researchers have focused on the relationship between stalking and dating relationships. Using convenience samples of college students, their results suggest that stalking tends to occur after the breakup of a dating relationship (Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2000; Logan et al., 2000). Students have also reported using a wide range of stalking-related behaviors when trying to initiate a relationship with a person who did not reciprocate (Sinclair and Frieze, 2000).

Based on the results from the past stalking research, we would hypothesize that an attractive stalking target would be a young woman who regularly dates or has been or is intimately involved with a male. A would-be stalker might be attracted to this type of person as a target for two reasons: (1) a strong emotional desire, and (2) knowledge of the target's lifestyle-routines (see Meloy, 1996). This knowledge could include places or situations in which the victim lacks possible guardianship to prevent the occurrence of stalking.

**CAPABLE GUARDIANSHIP**

Lifestyle-routine activity theory assumes that the ability of a person or an object(s) to deter the offender and, hence, decrease the opportunity for a crime to occur is a central factor to understanding the risk associated with victimization. Researchers have examined the relationship of social guardianship—the presence of people—and of physical measures—target-hardening efforts—with the risks of personal and property victimization. Overall, the success of guardianship measures in decreasing the risk of victimization has been mixed; some studies report lower risks of victimization, whereas others do not (see Miethe and Meier, 1994). This may be due to a methodological issue—temporal ordering—that plagues the use of a guardianship measure in most cross-sectional studies; such studies cannot disentangle which came first—the victimization or the guardianship. For example, Mustaine and Tewksbury (1999), using a cross-sectional design, report that women who carry mace or a pocket knife for protection are more likely to be stalked. Clearly, the direction of this relationship cannot be fully assessed because it is unknown if the guardianship measures were taken in response to the stalking.

Two recent studies use measures of guardianship—number of persons living in a residence—that most likely did not change as a result of victimization. Both studies report consistent results. Miethe and Meier (1994) report little supportive evidence for the deterrent effect of different forms
of guardianship—including the number of adult housemates—on individuals’ risk of stranger assault or robbery. Results from Fisher et al. (1998) are supportive of the Miethe and Meier results. They found that living alone on campus had no significant effect on the probability of on-campus violent victimization.

With respect to stalking, however, those persons who live alone may lack the social guardianship needed to deter a stalker. This may be so when a stalker chooses to use types of contact that require close contact, such as following or lying in waiting, or indirect contact, such as telephoning. Further, any type of person, from a former or current intimate to a stranger, may stalk a person who lives alone because they know that there is no one else who lives with the victim that could intervene or witness the stalker’s behavior.

METHODS

As part of a broader study of the sexual victimization against college women occurring on and off campus—our 1997 national telephone survey of 4,446 women attending two-year and four-year colleges and universities—we asked the respondents whether they had been a stalking victim. Using a data collection process based on the National Crime Victimization Survey, we developed a stalking screen question and a stalking incident questionnaire. Below, we detail our methods.

SAMPLING DESIGN

The sampling design was a two-stage process. Each stage of the sampling process is described below.

SELECTION OF THE INSTITUTIONS

We limited the selection of our schools to those institutions with an enrollment of over 1,000 students.5 In 1995, there were 924 two-year institutions and 1,351 four-year institutions with an enrollment greater than 1,000 students.

We stratified these institutions on two variables: (1) total student enrollment and (2) location of the school. The enrollment size was divided into

5. We did not include institutions with less than 1,000 students because most of these schools were religious schools (e.g., Bible colleges or Yeshivas) or were specialty medical schools. In addition, although institutions enrolling less than 1,000 students represent 32.6% (N = 447) of all two-year institutions and 37.9% (N = 823) of all four-year institutions, only 3.8% (N = 537,685) of post-secondary students in the United States are enrolled in these institutions (U.S. Department of Education, 1997). Because students were our main focus, we decided not to include these small institutions in the study (see also Koss et al., 1987).
four categories: 1,000 to 4,999; 5,000 to 9,999; 10,000 to 19,999; and 20,000 or more (U.S. Department of Education, 1997). The location designation for the institution was divided into three categories: urban, suburban, and small town/rural area (Peterson's Guide to Four Year Colleges, 1998; Peterson's Guide to Two Year Colleges, 1998).

Because of substantial within-strata variation of female enrollments, we selected institutions using a probability proportionate to the size6 (PPS) of the female enrollment. Using this methodological approach ensured us that there were enough female students at each institution from which to randomly select our needed sample size. A total of 233 two-year and four-year institutions were selected: 39 two-year schools and 194 four-year schools.7

Selection of Students

Students within each school were randomly selected. Each potential respondent was sent a cover letter to her school address approximately two weeks before she was contacted by telephone.8 This letter explained the precise nature of the study, stated that participation was voluntary, noted that the student would be contacted by an interviewer in the near future, included an 800-telephone number that she could call to verify the legitimacy of the study, and included an e-mail address to request the results of the study.

Response Rate and Sample Characteristics

We calculated the response rate using two different formulas; each produced high rates of response. First, we summed the total number of respondents completing the survey (n = 4,446) and the total number of respondents that were screened out (n = 496) and divided this figure by the total number of potential respondents contacted (n = 5,769). This formula generated a response rate of 85.6%. Second, we divided the total

---

6. The PPS design assured us that each institution was given a chance of selection into the sample proportionate to the size of its female enrollment.

7. Five schools selected during the first stage of the sampling design were randomly replaced using the PPS design because the number of female students required to meet the institutional quota exceeded the number of currently enrolled females available from which we would draw our sample of students. Therefore, including these five schools would have meant that a greater number of students would be selected from schools within the same cell. This procedure would have violated our initial sampling design.

8. We contracted with American Student List Company (ASLC), a respected firm that directly purchases enrollment listings every term (e.g., quarter, semester) from academic institutions. ASLC was unique in that it could provide each of the two parts of our sampling design: (1) a sampling frame of institutions; and (2) the names, school addresses, and phone numbers of the female students in the second stage.
number of respondents completing the survey \((n = 4,446)\) by the sum of
the total number of respondents completing the survey and the total num-
ber of respondents who refused to participate \([n = 4,446] + [n = 812]\). The
second formula generated a response rate of 84.6%.

We were not able to directly compare how representative our sample
was to the population of female students who were enrolled at two-year
and four-year colleges and universities for two reasons. First, although
demographic information (e.g., race/ethnicity, mean age) for all students is
published by the U.S. Department of Education, information for institu-
tions with 1,000 or more students is not published. Second, the U.S.
Department of Education does not break down student demographic
information by sex. We can, however, provide the demographic character-
istics of our sample that appear to be similar to the characteristics of
students in institutions of all sizes (compare the following with information
provided in footnote 9).

Most of our sample \((n = 4,446)\) were full-time students (90%) and
undergraduates (86%). Freshmen comprised 24% of the sample, sopho-
mores 22%, juniors 18%, seniors 22%, graduate students 12%, and others
(post-doctorate, continuing education, certification programs) 1.7%. As
expected, the sample was youthful: just over 76% of the sample were
between the ages of 17 and 22 years old. Most of the sample were White-
Caucasian, non-Hispanic/Latina (80.6%), followed by African American,
non-Hispanic/Latina (7.0%), Hispanic/Latina (6.2%), Asian or Pacific
Islander (3.4%), Native American or Alaska Native (0.8%), and mixed
(1.5%). Less than 1 percent (0.54) refused or did not know their race or
ethnicity. Forty-four percent described their family when they were grow-
ing up as middle class, followed by 38% who reported their family as
upper middle class, 12% as working poor, 4% as upper class, and 2% as
poor.

Almost all respondents were not married (91%). Of those not married,
7% were currently living with an intimate partner. Of those not living

---

9. Institutions with less than 1,000 students, comprise only 3.8% \((N = 537,685)\) of
all students in post-secondary education. As such, it is expected that the characteristics
presented closely represent the population from which our sample was drawn.
Although the majority (87.6%) of all students were undergraduates, a significant por-
tion (12.4%) were graduate students. Assessing class status reveals that 32.7% were
freshmen or other first-time students, 19.8% were sophomores, 10.0% were juniors, and
12.3% were seniors (U.S. Department of Education, 1997). The remaining were unclas-
sified (1.0%) or were classified only as taking credit courses (11.5%). A slight majority
(56.9%) of them were full-time students and female (55.6%). A substantial percentage
(40.0%) were under the age of 22. Most (74.7%) of all students were white, non-His-
ppanic followed by African-American, non-Hispanic (10.7%), Hispanic (7.9%), Asian or
Pacific Islander (5.8%); and Native American or Alaskan Native (1.0%) (U.S. De-
partment of Education, 1997).
with an intimate partner, 31% were in a relationship that had lasted a year of more, 19% were in a relationship that has lasted less than a year, 26% dated, but not anyone seriously, 20% rarely dated, and 5% never dated. Almost all were heterosexual (97.5%); less than 2% were bisexual (1.7%), and less than 1% were lesbian (0.8%). Most respondents were not members of or a pledge to a social sorority (just over 87%). Fifty-one percent of the students lived on campus.

DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

We contracted with Schulman, Ronca and Bucuvalas, Inc. (SRBI) to administer the surveys using a computer-aided telephone interviewing (CATI) system (see Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998). The telephone calls were made by professionally trained female interviewers (see Schulman, Ronca, and Bucuvalas, Inc. 1998). Our field period lasted approximately 2.5 months; it began February 21, 1997, and ended May 5, 1997.

THE DEFINITION OF STALKING

To operationalize the concept of “stalking,” we examined previous stalking research and various state-level and federal-level legal definitions of stalking (e.g., Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998; U.S. Department of Justice, 1996). We defined stalking as the same person exhibiting repeated pursuit behavior that seemed obsessive and made the respondent afraid or concerned for her safety.

The use of the term “stalking” raises two issues. First, unlike other crimes in which a single occurrence of the offender’s behavior (i.e., robbery), stalking is the occurrence of two or more pursuit behaviors by an offender.10 Second, like a criminal act in which a single occurrence of the offender’s behavior is referred to as an incident, we refer to stalking as an incident. We use these two terms interchangeably throughout our paper.

So that the term “incident” is not confused with course of conduct or pattern of behavior, we used the term “pursuit behavior” to refer to the type of behavior exhibited by the stalker. Under legal statutes, pursuit behavior could be the same type of behavior (e.g., following on two or more occasions), or different types of behavior (e.g., followed and waited afar, or telephoned and followed) exhibited by the stalker.

10 Although specific legal definitions of “criminal” stalking vary widely from statute to statute, all statutes proscribe behavior that constitutes a pattern of conduct that seeks to harass or threaten the safety of another person. In most states, three basic elements are needed to criminally charge and convict a defendant of stalking: (1) a course of conduct or pattern of behavior; (2) the presence of a threat; and (3) the criminal intent to cause fear in the victim. Most statutes describe the course of conduct as the repeated (usually two or more times) following, pursuing, or harassing of another person.
THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

To measure the extent and nature of stalking in our sample, the questionnaire contained two parts. First, an "individual-level" instrument measured characteristics of the respondents. Also included were screening questions to determine if the respondents had been stalked since the school year began in Fall of 1996. Thus, the reference period for this study was the start of the academic year. Second, an "incident-level" instrument asked detailed questions about the characteristics of the stalking. This latter instrument was only completed if a respondent screened in—that is, if she had indicated she had been a victim of a stalking on the individual-level questionnaire (see below).

THE INDIVIDUAL-LEVEL INSTRUMENT

Several questions were used by interviewers to confirm each student's willingness and eligibility to participate in the survey (e.g., enrolled continuously since the Fall term at their current college or university). Regardless of whether a respondent had been stalked, all respondents were asked a series of questions relating to four forms of prior sexual victimization—that is, completed rape, attempted or threatened rape, unwanted touching of a sexual nature, and sexual intercourse or contact from threats of non-physical punishment or promise of reward—occurring prior to school starting in the Fall of 1996. They were also asked about their lifestyle (e.g., since the Fall of 1996: how often they had been inside a fraternity house, gone to a party sponsored by a fraternity house, gone to a bar, pub, or club; frequency of alcohol consumption to get drunk), and demographic characteristics (e.g., year born, family status, race/ethnicity, marital status).

To broadly measure the extent of stalking, we developed the following screen question that the interviewers asked of all respondents:

Since school began in the Fall of 1996, has anyone—from a stranger to an ex-boyfriend—repeatedly followed you, watched you, phoned, written, e-mailed, or communicated with you in other ways in a way that seemed obsessive and made you afraid or concerned for your safety?

11. It should also be noted that the research team led two focus groups with college students to discuss the content and clarity of the stalking screen question and the cover letter. The research team members read them the question and then led the discussion for approximately one and half hours.

12. Both instruments were pretested in the Spring of 1996 using a telephone survey of 108 randomly selected female undergraduate and graduate students attending a large urban university. In the pretest, 14.8% of the respondents reported that they had been a stalking victim since school began in the Fall of 1995.
If the respondent answered "yes" to this question, she was then asked the following follow-up question:

How many people exhibited this type of behavior towards you since school began in the Fall?

Each respondent was then asked additional questions in an incident questionnaire about the nature of the stalking (see below). If the respondent reported that there was more than one person who stalked her during this time period, the interviewer completed a separate incident report for each of the stalkers. For example, if two different persons stalked one respondent, this would be two separate occurrences of stalking. The interviewer started with the most recent stalking, and then proceeded chronologically until reports were completed for all of the stalkers indicated in the follow-up question.

The Incident Report

We developed an incident-level questionnaire to collect detailed information about the stalking and its effects on the victim. The questions on the incident report included: the types of pursuit behavior (e.g., waiting outside or inside places, watching from afar, sending unwanted letter or cards), duration of the pursuit behavior(s) (e.g., length of time in days, weeks, months, and years), intensity (e.g., more than once a day, at least once daily, two to six times a week, once a week, twice to three times a month, and less than twice a month), and location of where the stalker exhibited the pursuit behavior (e.g., on campus, off campus, or both, and specific locations—at a social activity, at your residence). We also asked if the stalker(s) made any threats of harm or attempts to harm the victim, and if the respondent suffered any injuries (i.e., physical ones, including stab wounds, internal injuries, bruises, or emotional and psychological ones), and about the characteristics of the stalker(s) (e.g., relationship to the victim and sex). Finally, we asked the respondent about her reporting behavior in terms of reporting the stalking to the police. If the incident was reported to the police, the interviewer asked the respondent to identify the police authority. If the incident was not reported to the police, the interviewer asked the respondent why the incident had not been reported to the police. We also asked if the respondent had told someone else about the incident and who that person was (e.g., a family member, a friend, a victim service hotline). Last, we asked the respondent if she had taken any other actions as a result of the stalking (e.g., avoided the person who had stalked her, dropped a class the person was enrolled in, sought psychological counseling, filed civil charges, bought a weapon).
MEASURES USED IN THE MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

We used lifestyle-routine activity theory to guide the selection of variables to include in a model of the risk of being stalked (for a detailed description of all the variables, see the Appendix). Researchers have used these theories extensively to explain violent victimization in the general population (see Miethe and Meier, 1994; Sampson and Lauritsen, 1990), violent on-campus victimization of college students (see Fisher et al., 1998), sexual victimization among college women (see Schwartz and Pitts, 1995), and stalking among college women (see Mustaine and Tewksbury, 1999).

PROXIMITY TO MOTIVATED OFFENDERS MEASURES

Research has suggested that the likelihood of victimization increases with the amount of exposure a person has to potential perpetrators (see Koss and Dinero, 1989; Miethe and Meier, 1994). In support of this proposition, recent work reports that victimized women tend to have a greater number of dating and sexual partners (see Harney and Muehlenhard, 1991).

To capture the extent of a person being in proximity to potential offenders, we employed four measures: (1) the current enrollment status (part-time or full-time); (2) the sex of the individuals who live in the respondent’s respective dormitory to represent closeness to potential student offenders (coed or all female); (3) location of the respondent’s residence (on or off campus); and (4) a five-item scale that measures the propensity to be at places where there may be men exclusively. For each respondent, we calculated their respective mean value for this scale.

EXPOSURE TO CRIME MEASURES

Researchers have shown that exposure to certain types of situations at particular times, under particular circumstances, and with particular kinds of persons plays a role in victimization risk (Cohen and Felson, 1979; Hindelang et al., 1978; Miethe and Meier, 1994). The lifestyle-routine activity theory and sexual victimization research consistently has shown that certain lifestyles-routines—such as partaking in high alcohol and drug consumption and frequenting bars, clubs, and parties—increase the risks of victimization (see Belknap and Erez, 1995; Crowell and Burgess, 1996; Fisher et al., 1998; Miethe and Meier, 1994; Sampson and Lauritsen, 1990; Schwartz and Pitts, 1995).

To measure exposure to crime, we created a two-item scale from questions asked in our survey: propensity to be at places where alcohol is served. For each respondent, we calculated her respective mean value for this scale. Similar to other college student victimization research, we
employed membership in a social sorority as a measure of exposure to risk because researchers have reported that sorority members have a high prevalence rate of sexual victimization (Fisher et al., 1998; Rivera and Regoli, 1987). Finally, because of the mixed results in previous stalking research, we included two measures of a respondent's substance use since school began in the fall of 1996: (1) how often she drinks alcohol to get drunk; and (2) how often she smokes pot or hashish (see Logan et al., 2000; Mustaine and Tewksbury, 1999).

**TARGET ATTRACTIVENESS MEASURES**

An offender selects a target because it has some value to the offender. In the case of stalking, the value could be based on an obsession or strong emotion from some previous contact or relationship that the stalker had with the victim. The stalking research results consistently report that the majority of stalkers are former or current intimates (see Coleman, 1997; Meloy, 1996; Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998). For this reason, we created four dummy variables to measure relationship status: (1) in a committed dating relationship of 1 year or more; (2) in a committed dating relationship of less than 1 year; (3) dating some people, but no one seriously or rarely date; and (4) never date.

We also know that stalking is primarily committed against young people (Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998). The "value" to the offender could be the physical or emotional attractiveness that a young target brings. For this reason, we included two youth-related measures: (1) age in years, and (2) class standing. For class standing, we created two dummy variables to measure rank in college—one for freshman or sophomores, and one for junior or seniors.

**GUARDIANSHIP MEASURE**

Guardianship involves the ability of persons or objects to prevent the occurrence of crime by social (interpersonal) or physical (target hardening devices) means (Cohen and Felson, 1979; Miethe and Meier, 1994). We developed one measure of guardianship: living alone. The sexual victimization research has found that many of these victimizations occurred in private places—for example, a residence—by someone the victim knew (see Belknap and Erez, 1995; Harney and Muehlenhard, 1991). Living alone may contribute to the risk of victimization because no one, other than the offender, is present to act as a suitable guardian.

**PRIOR VICTIMIZATION**

Previous sexual victimization research has repeatedly found that women
who had prior sexual victimizations were more likely to be at-risk of subsequent sexual victimization (see Belknap and Erez, 1995; Crowell and Burgess, 1996; Koss and Dinero, 1989). To control for previous sexual experiences, we created a dichotomous measure—victim or not a victim—of four different types of sexual victimizations occurring prior to school beginning in the Fall of 1996.

DEMOGRAPHICS

Some past general criminal victimization research and sexual victimization research has reported that victimization varies by certain sociodemographic characteristics, whereas other work has reported no differences (Fisher et al., 1998; Harney and Muchlenhard, 1991; Koss et al., 1987; Miethe and Meier, 1994; Sampson and Lauritsen, 1990). For example, Koss et al. (1987) reported that the prevalence of sexual victimization did not vary significantly by family income but did differ significantly by race/ethnicity—Native Americans had the highest prevalence of rape, and Asian-Americans had the lowest. As previously noted, Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) reported a similar result with respect to the relationship between stalking and race/ethnicity.

Following in this tradition, we included the following demographic characteristics: race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, family class, and academic class standing. Race/ethnicity was measured using five dummy variables: (1) African-American, non-Hispanic/Latina; (2) Asian or Pacific Islander; (3) Hispanic/Latina; (4) Native American or Alaska Native; and (5) Other, non-Hispanic/Latina (mixed, and other). Sexual orientation was measured as heterosexual and nonheterosexual (lesbian and bisexual). Family class was measured using the following self-defined attributes: poor, working class, middle class, upper-middle class, and upper class.

RESULTS
EXTENT AND CHARACTERISTICS OF STALKING INCIDENTS

The Extent of Stalking

The sample of 4,446 female students experienced 696 incidents (156.5 per 1,000 female students). The number of victims was 581 (130.7 per 1,000 female students)—a figure that is lower than the count of stalkings because a considerable proportion, 15% of the women (n = 88), experienced more than one stalking. These results thus indicate that 13.1% of the women in the sample had been stalked at least once since the academic year had begun—a period that averaged 6.91 months. Of those who had been stalked, 12.7% experienced two incidents, and 2.3% experienced three or more incidents. Although our percentage of stalking victimization appears high (compare with Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998), we should
re-emphasize that our screen question asked the respondents to include as stalking only those experiences in which the attention they received was repeated and done in a way that seemed obsessive and made you afraid or concerned for your safety. Moreover, stalking victims tend to be young (Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998). This result may also explain our higher estimate. Finally, consistent with the stalker characteristics research (see Meloy, 1996), nearly all of the stalkers were male (97.6%).

The Nature of Stalking: Types of Pursuit Behavior

Table 1 lists the nine types of pursuit behavior(s) used by the perpetrator(s) to stalk the women in the sample. As Table 1 reports, stalkers used nonphysically visible means to attract the attention of the victim (i.e., means in which they were not physically present). Thus, more than three-fourths of the incidents involved telephone calls, three in ten involved letters, and a quarter involved e-mail messages. Moreover, stalkers were often physically visible to victims. Thus, in half the incidents, they were seen waiting for the victim, whereas in more than four in ten cases they followed the victim or watched the victim from afar. Stalkers also typically had multiple contacts with the victim (see Meloy, 1996). On average, each stalking involved 2.9 forms of pursuit behavior (S. D. = 1.5).

The Duration and Intensity of Stalking

Computing how long the average stalking lasted is complicated by outliers in the data (e.g., seven victims reported being stalked for one day and one victim reported being stalked for ten years). The mean duration for the stalking, which is affected by the outlier cases, was 146.6 days; in contrast, the median duration for an incident was 60 days. In any event, the typical stalking experienced by college students is not brief but rather persists for about two months. Finally, at the time of the survey, in 18.1% (n = 120) of the incidents, the pursuit behaviors were still ongoing.

The intensity of the stalking also can be assessed by how frequently the pursuit behavior(s) transpired (see Table 2). Thus, in response to the question, “During this period, how often did these events occur,” four in ten respondents reported two to six times a week, whereas almost another fourth of the sample stated that the pursuit behavior occurred either daily (13.3%) or more than once daily (9.7%). Taken together, these results indicate that almost two-thirds of the victims experienced pursuit behavior(s) that was not only repeated but also consistently present in their lives. In contrast, only one-third of the sample stated that the pursuit

13. The median number of days did not change when we excluded outliers at both ends of the distribution (less than or equal to two days and more than four years). The mean, however, was reduced slightly to 137.2 days.
behavior(s) took place once a week or less, and of these victims, less than 4% reported the pursuit behavior(s) as happening less than twice a month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1. TYPES OF PURSUIT BEHAVIOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of Pursuit Behavior¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Stalking Incidents % (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0 (696)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Total will not sum to 100% because a stalking incident could involve more than one type of pursuit behavior. For example, in one incident, the stalker followed the respondent and e-mailed her.

² In 13 stalking incidents, we did not know what type(s) of pursuit behavior the respondent had experienced because she refused to answer this question. In 11 stalking incidents, the respondent refused to discuss the incident and did not complete an incident report. Thus, the denominator is 672.

HARM TO VICTIMS

The majority of the stalkings did not appear to have involved explicit physical threats or lasting injuries (the results are not presented in a table). Still, in 15.3% of the incidents, the victim reported that the stalker either threatened or attempted to harm her. With regard to the types of injury, in 30.3% of the incidents where the stalker inflicted an injury (n = 203), stalking victims suffered physical harm: 1.5% (n = 3) of the stalkings involved a “knife or stab wound,” 1% (n = 2) had “broken bones or had teeth knocked out,” 1.5% (n = 3) involved the victim being “knocked unconscious,” and 14.8% (n = 30) involved “bruises, black-eye, cuts, scratches, swelling, or chipped teeth.”¹⁴ Further, in 95.1% (n = 193) of the stalkings where an injury occurred, the respondents stated that they were “injured emotionally or psychologically.” We also should note that in 10.3% (n = 69) of the incidents, the victim reported that the stalker “forced or attempted sexual contact.”

VICTIM-STALKER RELATIONSHIP

As Table 3 shows, four in five victims reported knowing their stalker. In half of those incidents in which the stalkers were known, the respondent

---

¹⁴ Percentage may be greater than 100.0% because a respondent could give more than one response.
stated that the stalker was “well known” to them. As Table 3 also reveals, when stalkers were known, there was a link to an established or previously established relationship; more than four in ten were a boyfriend or ex-boyfriend. Almost a quarter of the known stalkers were classmates, about 2 in 10 were either a friend or an acquaintance (9.5% and 10.4%, respectively), and 1 in 20 was a coworker. College women generally were not stalked by college professors or graduate assistants, by employers/supervisors, by roommates/roommates, or by relatives.

LOCATION WHERE THE PURSUIT BEHAVIOR(S) EXHIBITED

As seen in Table 4, more than two-thirds of the pursuit behaviors used to stalk college women were exhibited either on campus or both on and off campus; 31.4% of these behaviors occurred exclusively off campus. Most often, victims were stalked at their residence. Other common locations for stalking were over the telephone or through e-mail, in a classroom, at work, or going to and from someplace.

VICTIM REACTIONS TO STALKING

Actions Taken by the Victim

In nearly three-fourths of the stalkings (73.1%), victims reported that they had taken “actions as a result of their stalking” (see Table 5). The most common response was to avoid or to try to avoid the stalker (43.2%), whereas another 0.8% stated that they did not acknowledge messages from the offender. Notably, in 16.3% of the incidents, the victim had confronted the stalker. In 5.6% of the incidents, respondents indicated that as the result of stalking, they became less trusting of others. Although not high percentages (under 5% of the incidents), victims stated that they had taken such actions as getting caller ID, improving the security on their residence, moving their residence, or dropping a class. Respondents were very unlikely to use the legal system to address the stalker(s); in a little less than 4% of the incidents did a respondent seek a restraining order, in
TABLE 3. RELATIONSHIP OF VICTIM TO STALKER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to Stalker</th>
<th>Extent of Relationship With Known Stalkers$^1$</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stalker Was Well Known</td>
<td>Knew Stalker Slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knew or Had Seen Stalker Before</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>(535)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalker Was a Stranger</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>(118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Saw or Heard the Stalker</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationship to Stalker if Respondent Knew or Had Seen the Stalker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to Stalker</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyfriend or Ex-Boyfriend</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classmate</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Worker</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Non-Relative</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband or Ex-Husband</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer/Supervisor</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roommate/Housemate</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Relative</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Relative</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Non-Relative</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Question only asked of respondents who knew or had seen stalker(s) before. One respondent did not answer the question.
2 Don't know (n = 10) and refused (n = 9) not included.
3 Don't know (n = 6) are not included.

only 2% of the incidents did the respondent file criminal charges, and in a little over 1% of the incidents did the respondent file civil charges. Victims were also not likely to use formal disciplinary processes available at the respective institution; only 3.3% of the incidents involved a respondent filing a grievance or initiating disciplinary action.

REPORTING STALKING

The survey also explored whether stalking victims reported being stalked to the authorities and, if so, to whom. Overall, 83.1% of the incidents were not reported to police or campus law enforcement officials. As Table 6 shows, of those incidents that were reported, on-campus stalkings
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TABLE 4. LOCATION OF STALKING INCIDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Stalking Incident</th>
<th>Percent of Residence</th>
<th>Percent of Answering Machine</th>
<th>Percent of Library or Classroom</th>
<th>Percent of Other Building</th>
<th>Percent of Through E-Mail</th>
<th>Percent of Through Someplace</th>
<th>Percent of Through the Mail</th>
<th>Percent of Through From the Way to Work</th>
<th>Percent of Through Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>(306)</td>
<td>(140)</td>
<td>(110)</td>
<td>(73)</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>(211)</td>
<td>(144)</td>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(154)</td>
<td>(115)</td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Don’t know (n = 4) and refused (n = 10) are not included.
2 Percentages may be greater than 100% because a respondent could give more than one response. Percentages are based on those respondents who reported at least one location.

were most often reported to campus police or security, whereas stalkings that occurred off campus (wholly or in part) were most often reported to the municipal, local, or city police or the emergency number 911.

Similar to results from other victimization surveys, common answers for not reporting a stalking included not thinking the incident was serious enough to report (72%), not being clear that the incident was a crime or that harm was intended (44.6%), and not believing that the police would think it was serious enough (33.6%). The victims, however, also noted that they did not report the stalking because of lack of proof (one-quarter), because they did not want their family (9.0%) or other people (8.5%) to know, because they did not know how to report the incident (10.8%), and because they were afraid of reprisals (15.3%).

Further, in nearly all incidents (93.4%), the respondents in the survey confided in someone that they were being stalked. Most often, they reported their experience to a friend (69.5% of the incidents), to a parent (32.1%) or other family member (15.2%), or to a roommate (21.9%). Only a small number of stalking victims reported that they were being stalked to resident hall advisors (3.2%) or to college professors or other university officials (3.5%).

RISK FACTORS FOR STALKING

Table 7 reports the results of the multivariate logit model that estimates which risk factors and demographic characteristics contribute to the likelihood of a college woman being stalked.15 Consistent with a routine activities/lifestyle perspective, measures of exposure to certain situations, lack
### TABLE 5. ACTIONS TAKEN BY VICTIM AS A RESULT OF THE STALKING INCIDENT(S)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoidance Actions</th>
<th>Judicial Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victims Taking</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action % (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoided or Tried</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Avoid the Stalker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not Acknowledge Messages or E-mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved Your Residence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped a Class the Person was In or Taught</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quit Your Job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed Colleges or Universities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed Majors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sought a Restraining Order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filed a Grievance or Initiated Disciplinary Action with University Officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went Forward with Criminal Charges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filed Civil Charges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions Taken by Victim1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Protection Actions</td>
<td>Psychological Reactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got Caller Id % (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Security System of Residence % (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel with a Companion % (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bought a Weapon % (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took a Self-Defense Class % (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Became Less Trustful or More Cynical of Others % (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sought Psychological Counseling % (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confronted the Stalker % (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Actions Taken but not Specified % (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Five respondents did not know and 10 refused to answer this question (n = 670).
2 Percentages may be greater than 100% because a respondent could give more than one response. Percentages are based on those respondents who reported that they took some action.
of available guardianship, and their proximity to motivated offenders each placed women at an increased risk of being a stalking victim.

In particular, women with a higher propensity to be at places with alcohol had a higher odds (1.14) of being stalked than did women who did not frequent such places. Lower means of guardianship also placed women at an increased risk of being stalked; women living alone had a higher odds (1.44) of being victimized by a stalker than did those who did not live alone. Notably, however, respondents who were dating, whether in a relationship for more than a year or only dating occasionally, but were not married or living with an inmate partner, also were at an increased likelihood of being stalked. In particular, women who were in shorter relationships—dating less than a year—were at a higher odds (compare the odds ratio of 2.53 with the odds ratio of 1.80 for “involved in a committed relationship more than 1 year” and the odds ratio of 2.07 for “some dating”)

examine the effects of level 1 (individual level) and level 2 (campus level) characteristics on the risk of being stalked. This approach is not feasible with our data for two reasons. First, we interviewed an unequal number of women across our selected schools, and for some schools, only a small number of women were interviewed. For example, we interviewed less than ten women in 33% of our schools. There are too few respondents per school in a significant proportion of our selected schools to produce reliable estimates of the variance at level 2 (see Cohen, 1998; Wiersema, 1999). Second, to test if there is any level 2 variation in our outcome measure, we estimated an unconditional one-way ANCOVA. In this model, we employed whether or not the respondent was a stalking victim as the dependent variable and one level 2 predictor—school identification code (which school a respondent attended). We did this to determine whether the average likelihood of being stalked differs by which school our respondents are enrolled (see Bryk and Raudenbush, 1992). The $F$-test for the model the difference between the schools was not significant ($F = 1.05$, $df = 232$, 4213, $p = .313$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Stalking</th>
<th>Reported to Police (%)</th>
<th>Municipal, Local, City Police, or 911 (%)</th>
<th>County Sheriff (%)</th>
<th>State Police (%)</th>
<th>Other (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On Campus</td>
<td>14.7 (45)</td>
<td>86.7 (39)</td>
<td>17.8 (8)</td>
<td>2.2 (1)</td>
<td>0.0 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Campus</td>
<td>16.7 (55)</td>
<td>22.9 (8)</td>
<td>71.4 (25)</td>
<td>17.1 (6)</td>
<td>2.9 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>29.9 (32)</td>
<td>33.1 (17)</td>
<td>62.5 (20)</td>
<td>6.3 (2)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Percentages may be greater than 100% because a respondent could give more than one response.
of being stalked. This finding suggests that women are at their greatest risk of being stalked early on in a potential relationship; commitment in a marital or cohabiting relationship lowered women's odds of becoming a stalking victim. Women who were sexually victimized prior to the start of the academic year were also more likely to be stalked (1.54 higher than those who were not victimized).

Despite research suggesting that the demographic characteristics of the victim are not significantly influential in explaining stalking victimizations (Coleman, 1997; Mustaine and Tewksbury, 1999; but see Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998), some factors emerge that are notable in challenging this finding. Specifically, Table 7 indicates that in comparison to White, non-Hispanic/Latinas, Asians or Pacific Islanders were significantly less likely to be stalked, whereas other, non-Hispanic/Latinas and Native Americans or Alaska Natives were significantly more likely to be victimized. Notably, Native Americans or Alaska Natives had the highest likelihood (4.082) of any racial/ethnic group to experience a stalking. This finding is consistent with the sexual victimization research suggesting that Native Americans or Alaska Natives are at greatest risk of being raped (Koss et al., 1987) and stalked (Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998). Finally, stalking victims were more likely to come from a more affluent family background and be undergraduates versus graduate students or other students.

### Table 7. Multivariate Model Identifying Risk Factors of Being Stalked

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Odds ratio (90% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to Motivated Offenders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity to Be at Places with Men</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live in a Coed Dorm</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live On Campus</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Student</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity to Be at Places with Alcohol</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Drinking</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough Alcohol to Get Drunk</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>(.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Smoking</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>(.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot or Hashish</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>(.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of or Pledge to Social Sorority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td>$b$ Coefficient</td>
<td>Odds ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(S. E.)</td>
<td>(90% CI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Attractiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed Relationship of More than 1 Year</td>
<td>.59****</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(More than 1 Year)</td>
<td>(.20)</td>
<td>(1.30–2.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed Relationship of Less than 1 Year</td>
<td>.93****</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Less than 1 Year)</td>
<td>(.21)</td>
<td>(1.80–3.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Dating</td>
<td>.73****</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Some Dating)</td>
<td>(.19)</td>
<td>(1.51–2.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Date</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Never Date)</td>
<td>(.34)</td>
<td>(0.77–2.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Standing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen/Sophomore</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Freshmen/Sophomore)</td>
<td>(.21)</td>
<td>(1.37–2.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior/Senior</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Junior/Senior)</td>
<td>(.19)</td>
<td>(1.13–2.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>−.005</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Age)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(0.97–1.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of Guardianship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Alone</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Live Alone)</td>
<td>(.12)</td>
<td>(1.17–1.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior Victimization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Sexual Victimization</td>
<td>.43****</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Prior Sexual Victimization)</td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td>(1.44–1.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographic Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Class</td>
<td>.23****</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Family Class)</td>
<td>(.06)</td>
<td>(1.13–1.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>−.08</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(African-American)</td>
<td>(.21)</td>
<td>(0.65–1.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic/Latina</td>
<td>−1.19***</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Non-Hispanic/Latina)</td>
<td>(.46)</td>
<td>(0.14–0.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>.82***</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pacific Islander)</td>
<td>(.46)</td>
<td>(.14–0.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other,</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Other,)</td>
<td>(.20)</td>
<td>(0.80–1.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic/Latina</td>
<td>.138****</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Non-Hispanic/Latina)</td>
<td>(.30)</td>
<td>(1.40–3.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hispanic/)</td>
<td>(.30)</td>
<td>(1.40–3.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Latino)</td>
<td>(.28)</td>
<td>(0.80–1.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American or Alaska Native</td>
<td>1.38****</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Native American or Alaska Native)</td>
<td>(.40)</td>
<td>(2.07–7.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>−.08</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sexual Orientation)</td>
<td>(.28)</td>
<td>(0.59–1.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>−4.58****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Heterosexual)</td>
<td>(.67)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2 log likelihood = 3079.01
df = 24
Model $\chi^2 = 243.08$
Significance of model $\chi^2 = .0000$

* $p \leq .10$; ** $p \leq .05$; *** $p \leq .01$; **** $p \leq .001$.

**DISCUSSION**

**MAJOR FINDING: THE EXTENT OF STALKING**

This study's most noteworthy finding is that among college women.
stalking appears to be a common form of victimization. More than one in ten of the women in our national sample indicated that they had been stalked during the academic year, a survey reference period of approximately seven months. Estimating a victimization figure over a full calendar year is problematic, because we do not know if stalking becomes less common during the summer months when many students do not attend class and may spend more time in other geographical locations and social domains (e.g., work, leisure). Even so, it seems virtually certain that the annual prevalence of stalking would exceed the 13.1% figure in our sample. Further, we recognize the difficulty of using a seven-month statistic to estimate victimization across an entire college career (e.g., the risk of stalking may decline as college students gain seniority on campus; some students may be multiple or “repeat” victims). Nonetheless, based on our findings, it is plausible to suggest that, in the least, a substantial minority of women will experience stalking during their college careers (see also, Bjerrregaard, 2000)—careers that today average nearly 6.29 years (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1996).

IS STALKING A SERIOUS PROBLEM?

A Critique

In a more general analysis of “problems” that prove unfounded, Glassner (1999) suggests that Americans are often “afraid of the wrong things” and enmeshed in a “culture of fear.” In this context, we suspect that conservative commentators would caution that our findings and the policy conclusions drawn from them are overly alarmist. In general, these commentators view claims of high prevalence rates for sexual victimization as an ideologically inspired social construction of reality. Thus, calling feminist investigations in this area “advocacy research,” Gilbert (1997:123) contends that ostensibly high rates of sexual victimization are an artifact of measurement strategies that, among other things, define “a problem so broadly that it forms a vessel into which almost any human difficulty can be poured.” The feminists’ goal, he argues, is to show that sexual victimization is so pervasive that it must reflect structures of inequality in society—inequality that, in turn, is in need of fundamental social change. “They tend not only to see their client group’s problems as approaching epidemic proportions but to attribute the underlying causes to oppressive social conditions—such as sexism,” observes Gilbert (1997:112–113). “If 5 percent of females are sexually abused as children, the offenders are sick deviants; if 50 percent of females are sexually abused as children, the problem is the way that males are regularly socialized to take advantage of females.”
A Response

Leaving aside the accuracy of Gilbert's critique relevant to research on other forms of sexual victimization such as rape (compare with Koss 1992, 1993, 1996), it is incumbent upon us to address the issue of whether the 13.1% figure we report is artificially inflated. To an extent, Gilbert's perspective is useful in warning against grouping all forms of stalking together. Our data reveal that like other forms of victimization (see Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1997), stalking incidents with less serious consequences are far more widespread. About 85% of the incidents resulted in no threatened or attempted physical harm to victims. Further, over eight in ten incidents were not reported to the police, with the main reason being given that the stalking "was not serious enough to report." Taken together, these findings could be used to suggest that many of the stalkings in this sample may not qualify as crimes, because most states require either an explicit threat or the requirement that a "reasonable person" would interpret the behavior of the stalker as threatening (U.S. Department of Justice, 1996).

Although disaggregating the data may be useful in guarding against the conclusion that an epidemic of life-threatening criminal stalking grips the nation's ivory towers, other findings in our study caution against seeing the high rate of stalking as inconsequential. Thus, in designing our study, we endeavored to avoid Gilbert's (1997) concern that bias is introduced when researchers use an overly broad definition of what counts as a sexual victimization. Instead, we employed a screen question that specifically asked if the stalking behavior had been "repeated," "obsessive," and "made you afraid or concerned for your safety." We relied on this definition to rule out truly petty forms of attentive behavior that, although rude or bothersome, were not repeated and salient enough to induce fear or concern. Although response errors are possible, it seems likely that our measure detected mainly patterns of behavior that would be widely regarded as "stalking."

This conclusion gains credence when the nature of the stalking incidents are examined. As reported, victims were typically stalked for two months, with two-thirds indicating that offenders contacted them in some way at least two to six times a week. Again, we cannot say what proportion of these stalking incidents formally crossed the line into criminal behavior or, more pragmatically, would be prosecuted by a district attorney as criminal. More detailed information would have to be collected to discern whether the nature of the stalking would be reasonably seen as "threatening"—even if it did inspire fear or concern for safety in the victims. Regardless, the duration of and the frequency of contact in these incidents obviate any
claim that the offenders' conduct somehow was misinterpreted or misunderstood by our female respondents.

In fact, the measurement of stalking may be less open to methodological bias than that of other sexual victimizations precisely because stalking is a repeated pattern of behavior. For example, in assessing whether a rape occurred in an intimate relationship (e.g., on a date), measuring the key components of whether consent was given and force was used is a daunting enterprise—especially when respondents may not share the researchers' interpretation of these terms or, more holistically, may not see the event as a "rape," even when consent was absent and force was used (compare Gilbert, 1997 with Koss, 1992, 1993). These same challenges may be present if we were to ask a respondent if the single act of a person following her was obsessive and made her concerned for her safety. Was the behavior really stalking or just an awkward attempt to get the attention of a female student? However, when the acts continue again and again over time—that is, when victims have numerous "empirical observations" of the offender's conduct—it is unlikely that female victims do not know what is occurring in their lives and are erroneously reporting that they have been stalked. Accordingly, we can have a commensurate level of confidence that the prevalence of stalking reported in our study is not somehow widely inflated by the wording of the screen question we have used.

We would also be cautious about assuming that stalking incidents are merely petty simply because the respondents justify not reporting their victimization with the reasoning that the stalking was "not serious enough." First, the concept of "seriousness" is socially constructed and dynamic (see Lowney and Best, 1995). As Friedman (1985) notes, whether a "risk" is seen as normal and inevitable or as unacceptable and changeable varies over time. In this context—and independent of its objective consequences—stalking may only now be emerging as a "risk" that is perceived as being worthy of invoking legal intervention (see McAnaney et al., 1993). As noted, stalking laws are a creation of the past decade or so (Marks, 1997). Moreover, with few exceptions, prevention programs on college campuses dealing with the sexual victimization of women have not moved beyond important issues such as date rape to include stalking (Karjane et al., 2001). In short, assessments of seriousness may not be tied only to what occurs in a stalking incident but also to whether the larger culture defines stalking as a "crime" and whether the local campus "raises consciousness" about this form of victimization.

Second, stating that a stalking incident is not serious enough to call in the police is not identical to saying that the incident is not serious or otherwise consequential. Reporting a victimization to the police or to campus authorities must be balanced against the costs that such action incurs (e.g.,
time, anticipated anxiety over going to court, publicity). On college campuses, victims would also have to overcome norms against “turning in” or “snitching on” one’s fellow students. Most salient perhaps is that in four in five cases, the victims knew their stalkers. It may very well be that stalking would have to pass a high threshold—to have imminent or completed physical harm—before it would be seen as serious enough to warrant having a classmate or ex-boyfriend arrested. Consistent with this view, the victims in our sample were less likely to report a stalker if they knew the person and were more likely to report their victimization if the stalking persisted for a longer period of time, if they were followed by the stalker, and if they were injured.  

Relatedly, although victims did not often summon authorities to exercise formal social control, the data suggest that they did engage in “self-help” to cope with their victimization (see, more broadly, Black, 1983; Smith and Uchida, 1988). There is no evidence, for example, that the victims perceived their stalking to be so minor that they dealt with it as a purely private matter. Instead, more than nine in ten respondents stated that they confided in someone they knew—most often friends, family members, and roommates—about their being stalked. In turning to those close to them, it is likely that they were seeking social support to help them cope with their stalking. Further, in nearly three-fourths of the incidents, victims took some action in response to their victimization. Most often this involved avoiding the stalker or, in a smaller but not insignificant number of cases, confronting the stalker directly (see also Bjerregaard, 2000; Fremouw et al. 1996).

Taken together, this discussion suggests that the prevalence of stalking in our study is not due to methodological artifacts and that most stalking incidents—even if not physically harmful—result in victims exercising coping responses. But let us assume for the moment that conservative critics are correct and that most of what our respondents report is relatively minor—certainly not life-threatening or criminal, mostly just aggravating male behavior—and thus is not deserving of sustained social intervention. The danger in this reasoning is that in their contentious efforts to deconstruct supposed feminist claims that sexual victimization occurs in epidemic proportions, these critics make the opposite error of “normalizing” the unwanted intrusion of males into the lives of women in private and in public—of engaging in what Moynihan (1993) once termed “defining deviance down.” That is, why should women have to endure the persistent, if not obsessive, violation of their lives? Even if only mildly

---

16. The results from our estimated multivariate logit model predicting reporting to the police or campus law enforcement are not presented in this paper. The results, however, are available on request from the first author.
and episodically unnerving—only enough to cause a female to avoid the stalker and to seek out a friend’s ear—why should this level of victimization be minimized? Why the sympathy for “men acting badly”?

We recognize, of course, that constitutional rights may expose citizens of any gender to a certain level of uncivil behavior. It may also be a reality that the criminal law will have a role in controlling only the more extreme forms of stalking. Still, on college campuses, administrators will have to wrestle with the question of the extent to which stalking is a problem that diminishes the quality of female students’ lives. The relatively high prevalence of stalking found in our data would seemingly suggest that this form of sexual victimization should not be ignored. This is an issue we return to below.

ROUTINE ACTIVITIES/LIFESTYLES AND THE RISK OF STALKING

Beyond the issue of the prevalence and consequences of stalking, the results have implications for routine activities theory—in two respects. First, Lynch (1987) notes the importance of assessing how victimization varies across different social domains (see also Fisher et al., 1998; Mustaine, 1997). To the extent that college campuses are distinctive domains, lifestyle-routine activity theory would predict that the nature of victimization would differ from that of other social domains—at least to the extent that features of campus life influence the intersection in time and space of motivated offenders, attractive targets, and capable guardianship. Contrary to much rhetoric in the media, research suggests that institutions of higher education may insulate students from most serious forms of “street” crime (see Fisher et al., 1998). Coterm inously, however, colleges and universities likely expose students—especially female students—to a higher risk of sexual victimization by people they know (see also Fisher et al., 1998; Koss et al., 1987). The typical lifestyle of college women is such that they come into regular contact with young men—men seeking social and sexual relationships—both in class and in recreational settings, during the day and at night, in public and in private locations, and often without much guardianship. Lifestyle-routine activity theory would predict that these routines would inevitably produce a high rate of sexual victimization among people who know one another. Consistent with this view, the analysis revealed that most victims knew their stalkers. Further, we found that the prevalence of stalking victimization among our national sample of college women to be much higher than that reported for the general female population (see Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998) and more similar to that reported in a comparable study of female students (see Mustaine and Tewksbury, 1999).

Second, the study’s results are consistent with the prediction of lifestyle-
routine activity theory that the risk of stalking victimization varies among college women according to their lifestyles. Thus, women's risk of stalking was significantly enhanced for those who frequented places where alcohol was served (i.e., exposure to crime), lived alone (i.e., absence of guardianship), and were involved in dating relationships (i.e., close proximity to motivated offender). Women who frequently go to parties, bars, or clubs where alcohol is served may come in contact with sexually predatory people (see Schwartz and Pitts, 1995). Women who live alone may be more vulnerable to stalkers because they are suitable targets; namely, there are fewer barriers for the stalker, including someone other than the victim to witness the obsessive behavior. When women date frequently, it may increase their chances of meeting and becoming intimate with a person who may become obsessive toward them (see Meloy, 1996). Although the statistical prevalence of former or current intimate stalking is not known, the literature on the characteristics of stalkers and stalking victims both suggest that there is a link between stalking and intimate relationships (see Meloy, 1996; Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998).

Consistent with the results from several sexual victimization studies (see Crowell and Burgess, 1996), women who were previously sexually victimized were more likely to be a stalking victim. We have no firm data on why this relationship exists, but some insight may be drawn from Finkelhor and Asdigan's (1996:6) work on "target congruence." In an extension of the routine activities concept of target attractiveness, Finkelhor and Asdigan note that "personal characteristics" may "increase vulnerability to victimization, independent of routine activities, because these characteristics have some congruence with the needs, motives or reactivities of offenders" (p. 6, emphasis in the original). Such congruence may be exacerbated by a victim's target vulnerability"—a situation in which a personal characteristic "may compromise the potential victim's capacity to resist or deter victimization. . . . the prototypical risk factors. . . . would be attributes like small size, physical weakness, emotional deprivation, or psychological problems" (p. 67). In this context, prior sexual victimization may increase a woman's vulnerability in relationships with men and decrease her capacity to deter men with propensities to engage in stalking. These speculations, of course, warrant further empirical investigation.

We also found that the risk of stalking varied among different types of women. Thus, undergraduates may be more likely to be stalked because they place themselves in a wider diversity of social situations that increase their exposure to the types of people who sexually prey on women. Compared with graduate students and adult students, undergraduate women also may be easier to stalk because their schedules are more predictable and routine (e.g., a political science class three days a week at 11:00 a.m., followed by a criminal justice class at 12:20 p.m., a daily work-study job
that begins at 3:30 p.m., dinner between 5 p.m. and 6:30 p.m., and studying in library from 7 p.m. to midnight). Further, Native American and Alaska Native women were more likely to be stalked than were women of other racial and ethnic backgrounds, and Asian and Pacific Islander women were less likely to be stalked. Caution should be exercised when interpreting these results because of the small number women in these two groups in the sample. It should be noted, however, that these results support those presented by Tjaden and Thoennes (1996, 1998).

IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY AND PRACTICE

The prevalence of stalking among college women suggests that this type of victimization is a public policy issue that warrants recognition and prevention (see also, Bjerregaard, 2000:401). At this point, however, there is little evidence that college officials recognize the seriousness of stalking or the need for a systematic response. Over the past two decades, college campuses have had to come to grips with their responsibility to address the sexual victimization of college women. Legally, institutions have increasingly developed procedures for processing complaints of various forms of sexual assault and sexual harassment. They also have implemented prevention programs (e.g., rape awareness seminars, self-defense classes) and counseling for victims. Despite these gains, stalking has largely fallen outside the formal concerns of college and university administrators. Thus, in a national-level study, Karjane et al. (2001) recently investigated the official sexual assault reports and documents of post-secondary institutions. Notably, in their sexual assault policies, only 1.5% of the institutions had a separate stalking policy and another 1.5% merely mentioned stalking in their reports. That is, 97% ignored stalking in their sexual assault materials (Karjane et al., 2001:52–53).

Stalking, of course, can occur not only on campus but also off campus. Similar to higher educational institutions, it appears that law enforcement departments also have “marginalized” the subject of stalking (Farrell et al., 2000:167). Even in a department that had begun to implement “a new stalking protocol” to respond more effectively to women’s victimization, Farrell et al. (2000:164) found that two-thirds of the officers surveyed either did not know that a written stalking policy existed or said that their department had no such policy. As Farrell et al. (p. 164) conclude, these results were not surprising because “in the year 2000, stalking is not a priority issue for police departments.”

If the first step in effective public policy is recognizing that stalking is a genuine risk for college women, the second step is devising strategies for preventing this victimization. Stalking presents unique prevention challenges because it is not a single episode but rather a victimization that is potentially repeated over time, space, and method. Still, useful insights
into possible prevention strategies may be drawn from routine activity theory and environmental criminology—even though these perspectives have largely ignored the prevention of stalking in the past (see, e.g., Clarke and Felson, 1993; Eck and Weisburd, 1995; Felson, 1998). Specifically, three types of approaches may be derived from these approaches.

First, similar to other forms of sexual victimization (Fisher et al., 2000), stalking is likely a byproduct of the routine activities of college women (e.g., dating, going to bars, living alone). One policy recommendation, therefore, is for women—potential victims—to be more aware of the risks they face and adopt more cautious lifestyles. Such information may well be provided in crime prevention seminars and in written educational materials distributed on campus. There are, however, two objections to this recommendation. On the one hand, because these activities are routine—that is, lifestyle patterns integral to being a college student—it is difficult to advise female students as to how to lessen their exposure to the risk of stalking. On the other hand, feminist commentators find it objectionable that women are admonished to alter and diminish the quality of their lifestyle, whereas males (including perpetrators) are not so compelled. Although providing potential victims information about risks is a rational approach to crime prevention, there is the corresponding danger that this kind of thinking can lead to “victim blaming.” At the very least, it “externalizes” the costs of crime prevention to women, a burden that exacerbates gender inequality.

Rather than expect women to alter their routines—except, perhaps, to avoid the riskiest of lifestyle choices and situations—an alternative approach may be to advise them as to “what to do” if a stalking incident emerges. Such “coping strategies” should involve equipping students with clear information as to which campus officials they should report stalking victimizations. It also may involve support or counseling services on and off campus. These services may be of particular importance because of the finding that women who have been sexually victimized in the past are more at-risk for a stalking victimization. Their cumulative vulnerability to victimization may require special intervention to ensure that their college careers are not derailed by the long-term presence of a stalker in their lives.

Second, routine activity/environmental criminology perspectives would also encourage innovative situational crime prevention strategies to reduce the opportunities for stalking. Again, a crucial ingredient would be to use seminars and educational brochures to encourage victims to report stalking incidents so that resources may be applied to make their victimization more difficult. Similar to rape prevention programs, one possibility would be to provide females with escorts on campus, with “guardians”
carrying videotapes to record evidence of stalking conduct. Another possibility would be to have residence hall personnel, professors, staff, and campus security function as "place managers" who are trained in how to discourage stalkers who are looming in a location (Eck, 1994; Felson, 1995). Such place managers may be particularly important in providing guardianship for female students who live alone. Further, when stalking occurs through the telephone or Internet, it may be possible to "harden the target" to block unwanted contacts or to devise methods to collect evidence for future legal intervention (e.g., printing a hard copy of the e-mail message and creating a separate directory for unwanted e-mail messages).

Third, these perspectives would suggest that stalking would be reduced to the extent that steps are taken to increase the effort it takes for offenders to pursue victims (Felson, 1998). Building on informal control theories, Felson (1995; see also, Eck, 1994) contends that misconduct can be "discouraged" if offenders are monitored by "handlers"—people whose social bond to an offender constitutes a "handle" that can be "grabbed" and used to exert social control. If a campus was able to create an awareness of the need for males to prevent one's peers from inappropriate pursuit behavior (e.g., through education), it may be possible for intimates to persuade or shame offenders from continued stalking. Another possibility, however, is to assign campus employees (e.g., counselors, ombudsmen) the task of confronting stalkers about their behavior (Felson, 1995). In doing so, they may exercise direct social control or provide a conduit for offenders to seek counseling. Reintegrative intervention styles may prove most effective in discouraging future pursuit behavior (Braithwaite, 1989; Sherman, 1993).

A certain proportion of cases, however, may well require formal intervention by institutions. In such cases, college administrators will have to face the daunting challenge of developing clear guidelines to incorporate into student disciplinary codes as to when stalking conduct violates a female student’s right not to be harassed and when it warrants formal hearings and punishments. Already, many post-secondary institutions are grappling with their disciplinary role when accusations of sexual misconduct are made. Further, as noted, few university codes of conduct contain either specific prohibitions of stalking or clearly articulated procedures for how violations of this sort would be processed (Karjane et al., 2001). In part, this omission reflects the fact that codes of conduct regarding sexual victimization are relatively recent "inventions," whose quality and comprehensiveness vary considerably across post-secondary institutions handled by grievance or disciplinary mechanisms (Karjane et al., 2001). A cultural lag of sorts will have to be surmounted before stalking becomes incorporated systematically into these codes.
We would urge, however, that college and university administrators take a proactive approach in dealing with stalking victimization. From a pragmatic standpoint, the very prevalence of stalking may expose institutions to considerable legal liability if they have taken no procedural or substantive steps to address this problem and a stalking incident turns tragic. From an educational standpoint, administrators should be concerned that so many of their female students have the quality of their college experience diminished by lengthy periods of unwanted pursuit behaviors by males. This victimization is a price of going to college that students should not have to bear or, if experienced, should not have to bear alone and without the support of institutional officials.
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### APPENDIX. DESCRIPTION OF MEASURES AND DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Variable Description and Descriptive Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stalking Victim</strong></td>
<td>Has anyone—from a stranger to an ex-boyfriend—repeatedly followed you, watched you, phoned, written, e-mailed, or communicated with you in other ways in a way that seemed obsessive and made you afraid or concerned for your safety? 1 = stalking victim. Mean = .13, Standard deviation = .34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exposure to Crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity to be at Places with Alcohol</td>
<td>An additive scale consisting of two items: (a) Since school began in the Fall of 1996, how often have you gone to a gathering or party where alcohol was served? (b) Since school began in the Fall of 1996, how often have you gone to a pub, bar, or club? Mean = 2.82; Standard deviation = 0.96; range = 1 to 4; Cronbach’s α = 0.71.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Drinking Enough Alcohol to Get Drunk</td>
<td>How often, if ever, since school began in the Fall of 1996 have you had enough alcohol to get drunk? 1 = never; 2 = once since school began; 3 = less than once a month; 4 = once a month; 5 = once or twice a week; 6 = more than twice a week; 7 = daily or almost daily. Mean = 2.95; Standard deviation = 1.61.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Smoking Pot or Hashish</td>
<td>How often, if ever, since school began in the Fall of 1996 have you smoked pot or hashish? 1 = never; 2 = once since school began; 3 = less than once a month; 4 = once a month; 5 = once or twice a week; 6 = more than twice a week; 7 = daily or almost daily. Mean = 1.54; Standard deviation = 1.23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of or Pledge to Social Sorority</td>
<td>Are you an active member or a pledge to a social sorority? 1 = member or pledge; 0 = not a member or pledge. Mean = 0.13; Standard deviation = 0.33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guardianship Measure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Alone</td>
<td>How many roommates do you have? 1 = living alone; 0 = not living alone. Mean = 0.16; Standard deviation = 0.36.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proximity to Motivated Offenders</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity to be at Places where there may be Men Exclusively</td>
<td>An additive scale consisting of five items: (a) Since school began in the Fall of 1996, how often have you been inside a fraternity house? (b) Since school began in the Fall of 1996, how often have you been inside an all male residence hall or all male residence floor? (c) Since school began in the Fall of 1996, how often have you been inside off-campus residences when only men were present? (d) Since school began in the Fall of 1996, how often have you gone to a party sponsored by a fraternity? (e) Since school began in the Fall of 1996, how often have you gone to a party attended by male student-athletes like football or basketball players? Mean = 1.91; Standard deviation = 0.76; range = 1 to 4; Cronbach’s α = .73.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Variable Description and Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Student</td>
<td>Are you currently 1 = part-time student (enrolled in less than 12 credit hours); 0 = full-time student (enrolled in 12 credit hours or more. Mean = 0.10; Standard deviation = 0.30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live in a Coed Dorm</td>
<td>Is your dorm or co-op all female or co-ed? 1 = coed dorm; 0 = not a coed dorm. Mean = 0.32; Standard deviation = 0.47.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live On Campus</td>
<td>Do you currently live on or off campus? 1 = living on campus; 0 = living off campus. Mean = 0.51; Standard deviation = 0.50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed Relationship of</td>
<td>(Reference category is married or living with an intimate partner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1 Year</td>
<td>Are you in a committed relationship of 1 year or more? 1 = yes. Mean = 0.26; Standard deviation = 0.44.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed Relationship of</td>
<td>Are you in a committed relationship of less than 1 year? 1 = yes. Mean = 0.16; Standard deviation = 0.37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Dating</td>
<td>Are you dating some people but no one seriously or rarely date? 1 = yes. Mean = 0.38; Standard deviation = 0.49.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Date</td>
<td>Are you never dating? 1 = yes. Mean = 0.04; Standard deviation = 0.20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior Sexual Victimization</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Sexual Victimization</td>
<td>A count of four items: (a) Prior to school starting in the Fall of 1996, did anyone ever make you have vaginal, oral, or anal intercourse, including penetrating you with a penis, a finger, or a foreign object, by using force or threatening to harm you? (b) Prior to school starting in the Fall of 1996, did anyone ever attempt but not succeed in making you have vaginal, oral, or anal intercourse, including penetrating you with a penis, a finger, or a foreign object, by using force or threatening to harm you? (c) Prior to school starting in the Fall of 1996, have you ever experienced any unwanted or uninvited touching of a sexual nature, or threats or attempts of such touching, including forced kissing, touching of private parts, grabbing, fondling, and rubbing up against you in a sexual way? (d) Prior to school starting in the Fall of 1996, has anyone ever tried to make you have sexual intercourse or sexual contact when you did not want to by making either threats of nonphysical punishment or promises of reward if you complied sexually? 1 = yes; 0 = no. Mean = 0.38; Standard deviation = 0.49; range = 0 to 4; Cronbach’s α = .68.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographic Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Class</td>
<td>How would you describe your family when you were growing up? 1 = poor; 2 = working class; 3 = middle class; 4 = upper-middle class; 5 = upper class. Mean = 2.69; Standard deviation = 0.80.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American, non</td>
<td>(Reference group is White/Caucasian, non-Hispanic/Latina)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latina</td>
<td>1 = African-American, non-Hispanic/Latina. Mean = 0.07; Standard deviation = 0.26.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Variable Description and Descriptive Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1 = Asian/Pacific Islander. Mean = 0.03; Standard deviation = 0.18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Non-Hispanic/Latina</td>
<td>1 = Other, non-Hispanic/Latina. Mean = 0.02; Standard deviation = 0.13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latina</td>
<td>1 = Hispanic/Latino. Mean = 0.06; Standard deviation = 0.24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Alaska Native</td>
<td>1 = American Indian/Alaska Native. Mean = 0.01; Standard deviation = 0.09.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Class Standing

(Reference group is graduate student, post-doctoral student, or other)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen/Sophomore</td>
<td>Are you a freshman/first-year student at a two-year college or a sophomore/second-year student at a two year college? 1 = yes. Mean = 0.46; Standard deviation = 0.50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior/Senior</td>
<td>Are you a junior or senior? 1 = yes. Mean = 0.40; Standard deviation = 0.49.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Natural age in years at the time of the survey. Mean = 22.55; Standard deviation = 4.25; range = 14 to 37 years (only 8 respondents reported being less than 18 years old)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sexual Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>Which of the following best describes your sexual orientation? 1 = heterosexual; 0 = bisexual or lesbian. Mean = 0.98; Standard deviation = 0.16.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*We calculated a mean based on the total number of valid responses that a respondent gave to the questions used in the respective scale. A scale score was given only to those respondents who answered a majority of the questions used in the respective scale. We did this for each additive scale we created.*