2004

Testing a Model of Unwanted Pursuit and Stalking

Leila B. Dutton-Greene
University of Rhode Island

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss

Recommended Citation

Dutton-Greene, Leila B., "Testing a Model of Unwanted Pursuit and Stalking" (2004). *Open Access Dissertations*. Paper 1099.
https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss/1099

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu.

BF 631.6
2004
2004

TESTING A MODEL OF UNWANTED PURSUIT AND STALKING

BY

LEILA B. DUTTON-GREENE

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR

THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

PSYCHOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

2004

ABSTRACT

Unwanted pursuit and stalking are common, especially among young adults attending college. Cupach and Spitzberg (2004) developed their relational goal pursuit theory to explain unwanted pursuit and stalking. They theorize that unwanted pursuit and stalking develop out of a disjunctive relationship in which one person wants a type of relationship that the other does not. They propose that the interrelated and co-occurring processes of rumination, emotional flooding, and rationalization serve to disinhibit a pursuer's idea of what is appropriate behavior. Thus, the object perceives the pursuer's behavior as excessive, inappropriate, and perhaps threatening.

I tested a model of unwanted pursuit and stalking based on Cupach and Spitzberg's (2004) theory. I hypothesized that jealousy, possessiveness, anger, shame, and guilt would contribute to rumination and emotional flooding which would, in turn, predict unwanted pursuit and stalking.

I first conducted a pilot study of the measures with 503 (320 females, 163 males, 20 sex not reported; $M = 18.89$ years, $SD = 1.55$) undergraduates who had difficulty letting go of someone after the breakup of a romantic relationship. For the final study, participants included 288 (227 females, 60 males, 1 sex not reported; $M = 18.78$ years, $SD = 2.68$) undergraduates who had difficulty letting go of a former partner. For both studies, students completed an anonymous online questionnaire which included measures of jealousy, possessiveness, anger, shame, guilt, rumination, emotional flooding, unwanted pursuit and stalking, and social desirability.

The results did not support the hypothesized model. Exploratory analysis revealed, instead, that possessiveness, anger, and rumination predict jealousy which, in turn, predicts mild pursuit. The results also indicated that possessiveness, anger, and rumination contribute directly to mild pursuit. The results provide a profile of a person who is likely to engage in mild pursuit after a relationship breakup. This person was possessive while the relationship is intact, angry after the breakup, and engages in rumination after relationship termination. Further, those who experience possessiveness, anger, and rumination are also more likely to feel jealous after a breakup and this contributes to the likelihood that she or he will pursue a former partner. These results have important implications for theory development as well as prevention and intervention efforts.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I could not have completed this dissertation without the guidance and encouragement of many individuals, including members of my dissertation committee, friends, and family.

I am grateful to Lisa Bowleg, my major professor. I am especially thankful for the amount of time she spent critiquing drafts of this dissertation. Her feedback helped me create a dissertation that met her high standards. With her guidance, I became a better researcher and writer. I count her as a friend as well as a mentor.

I thank the other members of my dissertation committee, Drs. Steve Grubman-Black, Margaret Rogers, Laura Beauvais, and Kat Quina. Their feedback and comments helped to strengthen this study. I also thank them for the laughter that infiltrated the committee meetings.

I must acknowledge the support and feedback that Bill Cupach and Brian Spitzberg provided. They encouraged the research I conducted for both my master's thesis and dissertation and for that I am immensely thankful.

I thank Gary Burkholder for his invaluable guidance in statistical matters. I also thank Joe Rossi for answering various statistical questions I had along the way.

Heartfelt thanks to Jennifer Huang for her support and friendship throughout my years at URI. I don't know what I would have done without our numerous phone conversations, email exchanges, shopping excursions, and dinners out. Probably graduated earlier.

I must, of course, thank my husband Mike Greene, who is currently in Iraq serving with the Rhode Island Army National Guard. He provided the emotional support, take-out food, and hugs that helped get me through the times when I never thought I could finish this evil thing called a dissertation.

Last, but certainly not least, I thank my parents, Cynthia and Robert Dutton, and my sister, Beth Dutton. It is a wonderful gift to have a family that believes in my ability to succeed in whatever path I choose.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	vii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	3
Stalking.....	3
Unwanted Pursuit	9
Theoretical Approaches to Unwanted Pursuit and Stalking	12
Attachment Theory	12
Integrative Contextual Developmental Model.....	13
Interactional/Relational Theory	14
Predictors of Unwanted Pursuit and Stalking	18
Hypothesized Model.....	22
CHAPTER 3: METHOD	25
Participants	25
Pilot Study	25
Final Study	25
Measures.....	26
Unwanted Pursuit and Stalking	27
Shame, Guilt, Anger	27
Jealousy	28
Possessiveness	29
Rumination	30
Emotional Flooding	30
Socially Desirable Responding.....	31
Other Materials.....	31
Recruitment Materials	31
Introduction to the Study	32
Demographics.....	33
Procedure	33
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS.....	34
Data Screening.....	34
Measure Development.....	35
Factor Identification	35
Unwanted Pursuit Behavior Inventory	35
Shame/Guilt/Anger Scale	36
Jealousy and Possessiveness Scales	38
Rumination Scale	40
Emotional Flooding Scale	40
Social Desirability Scale.....	40
Descriptive Statistics	45
Scale Means, Standard Deviations, and Score Ranges	45

Inter correlations among Variables.....	45
Confirmatory Factor Analyses.....	45
Test of the Model.....	49
Item Parceling.....	49
Identification of Higher-Order Factors.....	49
Model Analyses.....	50
Testing Nested Models.....	52
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION.....	65
Predictor Variables	66
Possessiveness	66
Anger.....	66
Rumination	67
Shame and Guilt	67
Social Desirability	68
Mediating Variables	68
Contributions of this Study.....	70
Theoretical Contributions.....	70
Methodological Contributions.....	70
Limitations of this Research and Directions for Future Investigation	71
Implications	73
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A. Unwanted Pursuit Behavior Inventory	75
APPENDIX B. Shame/Guilt/Anger Scale (Pilot Study).....	77
APPENDIX C. Jealousy Scale	78
APPENDIX D. Possessiveness Scale	79
APPENDIX E. Pursuit-Specific Rumination Scale	81
APPENDIX F. Emotional Flooding Scale.....	82
APPENDIX G. Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Short Form X1)	83
APPENDIX H. Recruiting Announcement (Pilot Study)	84
APPENDIX I. Recruiting Announcement (Final Study)	85
APPENDIX J. Introduction to the Study	86
APPENDIX K. Demographics Questionnaire	87
APPENDIX L. Shame/Guilt/Anger Scale (Final Study)	88
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	89

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1. Factor Structure of the Unwanted Pursuit Behavior Inventory for the Final Sample ($N = 288$).....	37
TABLE 2. Factor Structure of the Shame/Guilt/Anger Scale for the Final Sample ($N = 288$).....	39
TABLE 3. Factor Structure of the Jealousy and Possessiveness Scales for the Final Sample ($N = 288$)	41
TABLE 4. Factor Loadings for the Rumination Scale for the Final Sample ($N = 288$).....	42
TABLE 5. Factor Loadings for the Emotional Flooding Scale for the Final Sample ($N = 288$).....	43
TABLE 6. Factor Structure of the Social Desirability Scale for the Final Sample ($N = 288$)	44
TABLE 7. Means, Standard Deviations, and Score Ranges for Scales Used in Structural Model for the Final Sample ($N = 288$).....	46
TABLE 8. Intercorrelations among Latent Constructs for the Final Sample ($N = 288$)	47
TABLE 9. Summary Statistics of the Nested Model Comparisons	60

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1. Hypothesized Mediation Model of Unwanted Pursuit and Stalking.....	24
FIGURE 2. Standardized Maximum Likelihood Parameter Estimates for the Hypothesized Mediation Model of Unwanted Pursuit and Stalking.....	51
FIGURE 3. Model with Hypothesized Predictors and Mediators Reversed.....	53
FIGURE 4. Parameter Estimates when Hypothesized Latent Predictors and Mediators are Reversed	54
FIGURE 5. Model with Possessiveness and Jealousy as Mediators.....	55
FIGURE 6. Parameter Estimates for Model with Possessiveness and Jealousy as Mediators.....	56
FIGURE 7. Full Model with Jealousy as the Mediator.....	57
FIGURE 8. Path Coefficients for Full Model	58
FIGURE 9. Final Structural Model.....	63
FIGURE 10. Path Coefficients for the Final Model	64

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Cupach and Spitzberg (1998) define obsessive relational intrusion¹ (ORI) as the “repeated and unwanted pursuit and invasion of one's sense of physical or symbolic privacy by another person, either stranger or acquaintance, who desires and/or presumes an intimate relationship” (pp. 234-235). Thus, ORI involves ongoing pursuit, harassment, and invasion of a person’s life (Cupach, Spitzberg, & Carson, 2000). In part, the pursuer’s objective is to escalate or redefine a relationship with the goal of increasing intimacy (Cupach, et al., 2000). The object of pursuit, on the other hand, does not wish to increase intimacy with the pursuer.

Examples of unwanted pursuit behaviors include calling or e-mailing the object repeatedly, watching the object from a distance, engaging in excessive self-disclosure, sending unwanted gifts, claiming to still be in a relationship with the object, and following the object (Cupach & Spitzberg, 1998). Stalking is an extreme form of ORI (Cupach et al., 2000) and involves the willful, malicious, and repeated following and/or harassing of another person (Tjaden, Thoennes, & Allison, 2000).

The relationship of the pursuer to the object can vary from stranger (e.g., a fan pursuing a celebrity) to professional (e.g., a client pursuing a therapist) to former intimate relationship partner. The focus of this study is on unwanted pursuit that occurs after the breakup of a romantic relationship. More specifically, I refined and tested a model based on a theory of ORI and stalking advanced by Cupach and Spitzberg (2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002) with a sample of college students who had difficulty letting go of an ex-partner after the termination of a romantic relationship.

Cupach and Spitzberg (2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002) theorize in their relational goal pursuit theory that ORI and stalking develop out of a disjunctive relationship in which one person wants a type of relationship that the other does not. They propose that the interrelated and co-occurring processes of rumination, emotional flooding (i.e., being overwhelmed with negative feelings), and rationalization serve to disinhibit a pursuer’s idea of what is appropriate behavior. Thus, the object perceives the pursuer’s behavior as excessive, inappropriate, and perhaps threatening. As yet, this theory has not been empirically tested. Moreover, the role of jealousy, possessiveness, anger,

¹I use the terms obsessive relational intrusion and unwanted pursuit interchangeably throughout this dissertation.

shame, and guilt in ORI and stalking is underspecified. That is, Cupach and Spitzberg's (2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002) theory does not precisely predict how these emotions contribute to unwanted pursuit and stalking behavior. The purpose of this study is to examine the contribution of these emotions to rumination, emotional flooding, and unwanted pursuit and stalking in order to refine Cupach and Spitzberg's theory.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Stalking

In general terms, stalking is defined as a course of conduct that involves a person pursuing or harassing another in an intentional, repeated, and threatening manner (Spitzberg, 2002). In 1993, the National Institute of Justice provided a model antistalking code that suggests four necessary elements (Department of Justice, 1998): a course of conduct involving repeated physical proximity (following), or threatening behavior or both, with the incidents occurring at least twice; threatening behavior, including both explicit and implicit threats; and conduct occurring against an individual or her or his family members. Spitzberg (2002) asserts that there are two general approaches to understanding and defining stalking: structural and perceptual. A structural perspective defines stalking according to whether or not a certain pattern of behavior has occurred. The criminal justice system takes this approach. Stalking statutes vary from state to state, but most identify stalking as a course of conduct that involves willful and repeated harassing or threatening behavior that causes fear in a reasonable person (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; Spitzberg, 2002; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). Therefore, the conditions of intent (e.g., willful), persistence (e.g., repeated), intrusion (e.g., harassing), and threat must be proven in order for a person's activities to be labeled as stalking (Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002).

Researchers and theorists, on the other hand, tend to take a perceptual approach that locates the definition of stalking in the victim's mind (Mullen, Pathé, & Purcell, 2000a; Spitzberg, 2002). That is, they ask respondents if they have been pursued in an unwanted way, whether they would label the pursuer's behavior as "stalking," and how much fear they felt as a result of the pursuit (Spitzberg, 2002).

Early research efforts focused primarily on the structural perspective utilizing small clinical and forensic samples drawn from case files (Spitzberg, 2002). More recent research on unwanted pursuit and stalking, taking a perceptual approach, has been conducted with college student samples. To date, only two published studies that I am aware of have utilized national population samples of women and men in the United States who have been stalked (i.e., Hall, 1998; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998).

Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) conducted a national study of 8,000 women and 8,000 men. Respondents were predominantly White² (82.5%; 9.2% African-American; 5.1% bi/multiracial, 1.9% Asian/Pacific Islander; 1.2% American Indian/Alaskan Native). Using a definition of stalking that required victims to feel a high level of fear, 8.1% of women and 2.2% of men in the United States reported having been stalked at some point in their life. When using a less stringent definition of stalking that required the victim to feel somewhat or a little frightened, they found that 12% of women and 4% of men had been stalked at least once in their lives. Ninety-four percent of female victims identified their stalkers as male and 40% of male victims reported that their stalkers were female. When assessing relationship to stalkers, women were more likely to report that the stalker was a spouse or ex-spouse. Among male victims, stalkers were more likely to be an acquaintance or a stranger, 90% of whom were male. Ten percent of females and 9% of males reported that their stalker was a cohabitating partner or ex-partner. Fourteen percent of females and 10% of males indicated that the person who stalked them was a date or former date.

Hall (1998) conducted a national study of stalking in the United States. She surveyed a non-random sample of 120 female and 25 male victims about the individuals who stalked them. She stated that her participants were diverse in terms of ethnic background and age but did not report specific information on these variables. Hall categorized the victim's stalkers into three types: post-intimate relationship, prior acquaintance, and stranger. Fifty-seven percent of the stalkers were post-intimate relationship stalkers who had previously had an intimate relationship with the victim. Six of the nine female post-intimate relationship stalkers stalked a male and 72 of the 73 post-intimate relationship cases involved male-to-female stalking. Thirty-four percent of the victims were stalked by prior acquaintances (a term Hall defined as one that involves individuals "intimately involved with one another without a sexual component," p. 117) and 6% were stalked by strangers. Among the prior acquaintance stalkers, 94% of the females targeted males whereas 44% of the males targeted females. Among victims stalked by strangers, 62% of the females were stalked by a male and 66% of the males were stalked by a female. These results suggest that sex differences in stalking may depend on the type

² Throughout this dissertation, I use the terms the researchers chose to describe the race/ethnicity and sexual orientation of the participants in their studies.

of relationship that exists between the victim and the stalker. Men appear more likely to stalk women who are current or former relationship partners or acquaintances but women and men may be equally likely to stalk strangers.

Results from college student samples tend to yield higher rates of stalking victimization than those reported by Tjaden and Thoennes (1998). Fisher et al. (2000) suggest that college women are more likely to be stalked because their social domain places them in situations and in contact with a range of men that increase their chances of being stalked. Fisher et al. conducted a national survey of sexual victimization among 4,446 college women. They did not report information on participants' age or race/ethnicity. Of the women surveyed, 13.1% reported being stalked since the beginning of the school year and most victims knew their stalkers. The most common relationship of the stalker to the victim was a boyfriend/ex-boyfriend (42.4%), followed by classmate (24.5%), acquaintance (10.3%), friend (9.3%), and coworker (5.6%). Few were stalked by college professors or graduate assistants.

Bjerregaard (2000) investigated stalking victimization among a random sample of 788 college students. The majority of her sample was White (75%). She did not report the race/ethnicity of the remaining participants. She found that 24.7% of the women and 10.9% of the men reported being stalked at some time in their lives. Similar to results from national population studies (i.e., Hall, 1998; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998), male participants were significantly more likely to be stalked by someone of the same sex. Nearly 96% of female participants were stalked by a male whereas 67.9% of male participants reported that they were stalked by a male. For both women and men, the most frequently reported relationship to the stalker was that of ex-girlfriend or ex-boyfriend.

Logan, Leukefeld, and Walker (2000) investigated stalking as a variant of intimate violence. Their sample included 84 female and 46 male undergraduates ($M = 20$ years). Eighty-seven percent of the students were White. They did not report the race/ethnicity of the remaining participants. The majority of the participants were heterosexual (96%), with 3% indicating they were bisexual and 1% lesbian or gay. Logan et al. found that 29% of the females and 24% of the males reported being stalked after a difficult relationship breakup.

Dye and Davis (2003) examined the common factors between stalking and psychological abuse with a sample of 251 female and 87 male undergraduates ($M = 21$ years; 75% Caucasian, 23%

African American, 2% Asian American, 0.3% Hispanic) who had recently experienced the breakup of a romantic relationship. The average breakup had occurred 19 months prior to participating in the study. Dye and Davis did not report the sexual orientation of their participants. They found that 36% of the students in their study reported engaging in a specific stalking behavior at least twice in an attempt to reestablish the relationship. There were no sex differences in rates of reported stalking behaviors.

Some researchers use samples of stalkers who come to the attention of mental health agencies and/or the criminal justice system. Using case materials from a community forensic mental health clinic that specializes in stalking assessment and management, Purcell, Pathé, and Mullen (2001) conducted a study of women who stalk. The median age of the women was 35. Purcell et al. did not report the race/ethnicity of these women. They compared 40 female stalkers to 150 male stalkers on a number of variables including prior relationship to their victim. Women were significantly more likely than men to stalk those with whom they had professional contacts such as psychiatrists, psychologists, and family physicians. This may be because women, in general, are more likely than men to seek psychological and medical help (Addis & Mahalik, 2003; U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, 1998). Further, individuals prone to psychological disorders associated with stalking (e.g., mood disorders, drug and alcohol diagnoses, dependent personality disorder) are more likely to receive psychological, psychiatric, and medical services than individuals without such disorders. Thus, psychiatrists, psychologists, and physicians are at greater risk of becoming a target of stalking by mentally ill women. Purcell et al. (2001) found that women were less likely to stalk former intimates than men. This result may be confounded by the fact that men tend to feel less fearful (Bjerregaard, 2000; Davis, Coker, & Sanderson, 2002) and threatened (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2000) than women when stalked. Men may be stalked by women at the same rates as women are stalked by men but men may be less likely to identify the behavior as stalking. In approximately 23% of the cases Purcell et al. (2001) examined, the victim was a former relationship partner.

Meloy and Boyd (2003) conducted an archival study of female stalkers from the United States, Canada, and Australia. They analyzed demographic, clinical, and forensic data on 82 female stalkers. They found that female stalkers were more likely to be heterosexual, single, educated, and in their mid-30s. These women had typically stalked their victims for more than one year. Their victims were more

likely to be male acquaintances. The primary motivation of these female stalkers was to establish rather than restore intimacy with the victim.

Research indicates that same-sex stalking occurs (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). Little research, however, has been conducted specifically on same-sex stalking. To date, researchers either focus on data from entirely heterosexual samples (e.g., Dutton-Greene & Winstead, 2000; Sinclair & Frieze, 2000) or assume that data from lesbian, gay, and/or bisexual participants are no different from their heterosexual participants (e.g., Logan et al., 2000).

Mullen et al. (2000a) conducted the only published research to date that specifically investigated same-sex stalking. They examined case materials drawn from referrals to a community mental health clinic. Eighteen percent ($N = 29$) of the 163 stalkers referred to the clinic had targeted same-sex victims, with 18 female and 11 male stalkers in the sample. Twenty-eight of the 29 stalkers reported their sexual orientation and 57.1% were heterosexual, 20.7% were bisexual, and 17.8% were lesbian or gay. The median age of same-sex stalkers was 38. Mullen et al. did not report the race/ethnicity of the stalkers or their victims. Of the 22 victims for whom there was information on sexual orientation, all but three were heterosexual. When comparing same-sex stalking cases with a sample of 134 other-sex cases, Mullen et al. found that same-sex stalkers were more likely than other-sex stalkers to be female and were just as violent towards their victims as other-sex stalkers. The relationship of the stalker to the victim was professional (e.g., teacher-student, doctor-patient) in 28% of the same-sex stalking cases. Stalkers and victims were casual acquaintances in another 28% of the cases. In 24% of the cases, stalkers and victims knew each other through work and in 14% of the cases they were former intimate partners. In 7% of the cases, there was no prior relationship. More same-sex stalking occurred in a workplace setting and less took place in the context of a former romantic relationship. Mullen et al. stated that these results suggest that individuals who stalk someone of the same sex are not likely to be motivated by romantic interest. Conclusions drawn from this study, however, can only be tentative because they are based on a small sample of stalkers referred to a mental health clinic.

In some cases, individuals who stalk are motivated by romantic interest in the person. In other cases, they may wish to exert power and control over the victim. Research has revealed that stalking

occurs within the context of partner violence and abuse in same-sex relationships (Bernhard, 2000; Cruz & Firestone, 1998; Island & Letellier, 1991; Lie, Schilit, Bush, Montagne, & Reyes, 1991; Lockhart, White, Causby, & Isaac, 1994; Renzetti, 1992; Turell, 2000) and other-sex relationships (Burgess et al., 1997; Coleman, 1997; Crowell & Burgess, 1996; Kurt, 1995; Logan et al., 2000; Renzetti, 1992; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998; Walker & Meloy, 1998). Stalking may be part of an attempt to establish or reestablish domination over a romantic partner (Burgess et al., 1997). Therefore, it is likely that in some cases stalking is a part of a pattern of abusive behavior that an individual engages in against a current or former partner, regardless of the stalker's sexual orientation.

Results from Tjaden and Thoennes's (1998) study illustrate the link between stalking and partner violence and abuse. They found that stalking occurred frequently in the context of a current or former intimate relationship. Among female stalking victims, 59% were stalked by intimate partners, including current or former spouses, current or former cohabitants, or current or former girlfriends or boyfriends. Eighty-one percent of the women who were stalked by a current or former cohabitating partner reported being physically assaulted by the same partner. Further, ex-husbands who stalked either before or after relationship termination were more likely than ex-husbands who did not stalk to engage in emotionally abusive and controlling behavior toward their wives (e.g., made her feel inadequate, prevented her from working outside the home). Tjaden and Thoennes did not specify when the physically and emotionally abusive and controlling behaviors occurred – while the relationship was intact or after termination. Thirty percent of male victims were stalked by some type of intimate partner (i.e., current or former spouse, cohabitating partner, girlfriend or boyfriend).

In summary, stalking research indicates that women are victimized more than men, and that men are the primary perpetrators of stalking (Bjerregaard, 2000; Fisher et al., 2000; Hall, 1998; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). Women are more likely to be victimized by a current or former intimate partner whereas men are more likely to be stalked by an acquaintance or a stranger (Bjerregaard, 2000; Hall, 1998; Fisher et al., 2000; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). A small percent of female victims are stalked by someone of the same sex and a larger percent of male victims are targeted by males (Bjerregaard, 2000; Hall, 1998; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). Within some same-sex and other-sex relationships, stalking

occurs in the context of ongoing partner violence and abuse (Burgess et al., 1997; Coleman, 1997; Crowell & Burgess, 1996; Kurt, 1995; Renzetti, 1992; Walker & Meloy, 1998).

Because unwanted pursuit and stalking is common and can have serious psychological and physical consequences for the victim, it is important to develop a theory of ORI and stalking that can aid in the accurate prediction and effective management of cases involving unwanted pursuit and stalking with perpetrators and victims of both sexes.

Unwanted Pursuit

Use of the term “stalking” usually comes with an assumption of victims experiencing some degree of fear in response to the unwanted pursuit (Spitzberg, 2002). Although objects of unwanted pursuit can feel threatened and fearful, sometimes they feel merely harassed or annoyed (Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1998). Researchers who take a perceptual approach to studying unwanted pursuit often examine the phenomenon independent of degree of fear (Spitzberg, 2002). For example, Spitzberg (2002) distinguishes ORI from stalking in two ways. First, pursuers seek to establish or reestablish a relationship with the object whereas stalkers may be motivated solely by the wish to harass, threaten, or harm their object. Second, stalking requires that the victim experience a certain level of fear whereas ORI does not. Nonetheless, research indicates that victims often perceive minor levels of ORI as threatening (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2000) and that most stalking involves the pursuit of some type of relationship with the victim (Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg, 2002; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998).

Research also indicates that unwanted pursuit is common among college students (Cupach & Spitzberg, 1998, 2000; Dutton-Greene & Winstead, 2000; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Palarea, Cohen, & Rohling, 2000; Sinclair & Frieze, 2000). Cupach and Spitzberg (2000) reported data on 63 ORI behaviors (e.g., visited the object at work, checked up on the object through mutual acquaintances, spied on the object) from undergraduate women and men at two universities ($N = 666$). In the first and second samples, respectively, participants were predominantly White (79.6%; 60%) with smaller percentages of African Americans (8.4%; 5%), Mexican Americans (3.5%; 13%), and Asian Americans (2.7%; 7%). The mean ages for the two samples were 21.72 and 20.67. Cupach and Spitzberg did not report the sexual orientation of their participants. Students were asked to report the extent to which

they had experienced unwanted pursuit behaviors by anyone seeking increased intimacy such as former intimates, classmates, or work acquaintances. All ORI behaviors were reported by some participants to have occurred at least once. They reported less intrusive and less threatening behaviors more frequently. For example, 73% indicated that someone had called and argued with them and 5% reported that someone had sent them offensive photographs. Cupach and Spitzberg found no sex differences in any of the four ORI factors which include pursuit, violation, threat, and hyper-intimacy.

Dutton-Greene and Winstead (2000) investigated ORI after the breakup of a heterosexual relationship in a sample of undergraduate and graduate students ($M = 20.61$ years). The majority of the sample was White (74%) (10.4% were African-American; 3.6% Asian/Pacific Islander; 2.3% Hispanic; 2.1% indicated "Other" as their ethnicity; 7.6% provided no information about their ethnicity). Individuals who had had a difficult time letting a relationship end or whose partner had difficulty were solicited for participation. Of the 389 students who participated, 87.4% ($N = 340$) reported that they had engaged in or were subjected to at least one of the pursuit behaviors. Among objects of ORI, the most frequently reported behaviors the pursuer engaged in included leaving unwanted messages, invading the object's personal space, and making exaggerated expressions of affection. The least reported behaviors were being kidnapped and being sent threatening objects. Among pursuers, the most frequently reported behaviors were leaving unwanted messages, monitoring the person, and making exaggerated expressions of affection. The behaviors they reported engaging in the least included kidnapping the person and physically hurting her or him. Dutton-Greene and Winstead found no sex differences in degree of ORI pursuit or ORI aggression reported by either pursuers or objects of pursuit.

Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. (2000) investigated unwanted pursuit after the breakup of a romantic relationship. Their sample included 159 female and 123 male college students. Participants were predominantly Caucasian (91.8%), followed by 3.5% Asian American, 1.4% African American, 1.1% Hispanic, 0.7% Native American, and 1.4% "Other." The researchers did not report information on participants' sexual orientation or age. Similar to results from other research on unwanted pursuit, Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. found that participants reported milder forms of pursuit more frequently. For example, 55% of the pursuers reported leaving unwanted phone messages and none reported

injuring their ex-partner. Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. found no sex differences in breakup sufferers' or relationship dissolvers' total scores on the measure of unwanted pursuit behaviors.

Sinclair and Frieze (2000) conducted a study of initial courtship stalking with a sample of 197 female and 44 male undergraduates (mode = 18-19 years of age). The majority of participants were White (87%; 6% African American; 3% Asian, 2% mixed race; and 2% "Other"). They did not report sexual orientation for their participants. Sinclair and Frieze found that participants reported less severe pursuit behaviors more frequently than more severe ones. Among female participants, the most commonly reported pursuit behavior was doing unrequested favors for the person. Among male participants, the most common pursuit behavior was sending the person notes, letters, e-mail, or other written communication. The least frequently reported behavior for both women and men was physically harming the person "more than slightly" (p. 31). Sixty percent of female participants and 58% of male participants reported waiting for the person outside class or work. Seventy-four percent of female and 70% of male participants reported driving by the person's work or home.

In summary, college students report frequently engaging in the pursuit of another in an effort to establish or reestablish some type of a relationship. Not surprisingly, research reveals that pursuers engage in milder forms of pursuit more frequently than severe forms (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2000; Davis, Ace, & Andra, 2000; Dutton-Greene & Winstead, 2000; Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2000; Sinclair & Frieze, 2000). By themselves, milder pursuit behaviors constitute normal affinity-seeking behaviors in the processes of relationship formation and dissolution (Cupach et al., 2000; Emerson, Ferris, & Gardner, 1998). These behaviors become intrusive only when the person persists despite resistance and rejection by the object (Cupach et al., 1998; Cupach & Spitzberg, 1998).

Research indicates that men are more likely than women to engage in stalking (Bjerregaard, 2000; Fisher et al., 2000; Hall, 1998; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998) but researchers find few sex differences when considering perpetration of milder forms of pursuit (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2000; Dutton-Greene & Winstead, 2000; Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2000). Motivation may account for sex differences in stalking and the lack of sex differences in unwanted pursuit. For example, stalking may occur more often as a result of anger, revenge, and/or the desire to control which is more the

emotional realm of men whereas persistent pursuit in the name of love is socially acceptable for both women and men.

Theoretical Approaches to Unwanted Pursuit and Stalking

Theorists and researchers have taken a number of conceptual and theoretical approaches to explain unwanted pursuit and stalking. Some researchers have applied attachment theory (Dutton-Greene & Winstead, 2000; Kienlen, 1998) whereas others offer an integrative contextual developmental model of male stalking (White, Kowalski, Lyndon, & Valentine, 2000), while others have adopted an interactional/relational approach (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002).

Attachment theory. According to attachment theory, disruptions in emotional attachment to a primary caregiver in childhood can lead individuals to develop different types of attachment patterns that are carried into adulthood. Early research on attachment theory focused on two or three attachment patterns. More recent work has identified four or more styles (Bartholomew, 1993; Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998; Buelow, McClain, & McIntosh, 1996). For example, Brennan et al. (1998) have identified four attachment styles based on two attachment dimensions, anxiety and avoidance. Securely attached individuals are low on both attachment anxiety and avoidance. They are comfortable with closeness and possess a sense of self-worth. Individuals with a preoccupied attachment style are high on attachment anxiety and low on avoidance. They tend to seek approval and acceptance from others in an effort to feel secure. Individuals with a fearful attachment style are high on both anxiety and avoidance. They depend on approval and acceptance from others yet avoid intimacy to prevent experiencing rejection or loss. Those with a dismissing attachment style are low on anxiety and high on avoidance. Because of negative expectations of others, they avoid intimacy yet maintain a sense of self-worth by denying the value of intimate relationships.

Some research has found that attachment style is associated with engaging in unwanted pursuit and stalking. For example, Dutton-Greene and Winstead (2000) found that individuals with a preoccupied attachment style were more likely to engage in ORI pursuit. Attachment anxiety was also a significant predictor of ORI pursuit. Dutton-Greene and Winstead did not assess sex differences in attachment. Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. (2000) found that insecure and anxious attachment were

significant predictors of unwanted pursuit among breakup sufferers. They did not investigate sex differences in attachment style. Similarly, Davis et al. (2000) found that attachment anxiety was a significant predictor of stalking-like behaviors. They did not examine sex differences in attachment. Results from Spitzberg's (2000) study of predictors of ORI revealed that preoccupied attachment style was significantly correlated with perpetration of physical threat (e.g., physically restraining the person) and hyper-intimacy (e.g., making exaggerated expressions of affection), but not intimidation (e.g., physical endangerment). Among female participants, preoccupied attachment style predicted perpetration of physical threat and hyper-intimacy. Attachment style was not associated with ORI among male participants. White women, unlike White men, are socialized to be relationally oriented (Chrisler, Golden, & Rozee, 1996). This need for relational connection may be particularly strong in women with a preoccupied attachment style. Such women may respond with more severe pursuit behaviors than men with the same attachment style when they lose or cannot have an important relationship.

A significant limitation in using attachment theory to explain unwanted pursuit and stalking is the focus on a single explanatory variable. Attachment theory can only partially explain why some individuals engage in unwanted pursuit while others do not. In addition, it is unlikely that individuals with an anxious attachment style are the only ones who engage in unwanted pursuit and stalking. It is important to consider other individual factors as well as those outside of the individual (e.g., sociocultural influences), as do White et al. (2000) in their integrative contextual developmental model.

Integrative contextual developmental model. White et al. (2000) offer a model of stalking as a form of male violence against women. Their model assumes the interaction of factors at the sociocultural, interpersonal, dyadic, situational, and intrapersonal levels. At the sociocultural level, they examine historical, cultural, social, community, and neighborhood influences (e.g., sexual inequalities, gender role prescriptions, cultural norms governing use of aggression). Factors considered include cultural myths and norms about women and men, sex and violence, as well as scripts for relationship behavior. At the interpersonal level, the social network of the individual is the unit of analysis. Personal experiences within social institutions such as family, peers, and work setting are also examined. Factors considered at the dyadic level include the nature of the relationship between the

victim and the stalker, such as socioeconomic class differences, communication strategies, and whether the relationship is an intimate one. At the situational level, the focus is on variables that increase or decrease the likelihood of violence (e.g., time of day, location in which stalking behaviors take place, use of drugs and alcohol). At the intrapersonal level, the stalker's attitudes and motivations are analyzed. This can include an assessment of gender-related attitudes as well as feelings of hostility and anger toward the victim.

A serious limitation to White et al.'s (2000) theory is that it is inherently heterosexist. Specifically, it does not attempt to account for same-sex stalking. Letellier (1994) argues that feminist theorists' focus on partner violence as solely a form of male violence against women has contributed to the invisibility of same-sex partner violence. Similarly, focusing on stalking as a heterosexual problem will make (or keep) same-sex stalking invisible to researchers, clinicians, advocates, and law enforcement. Thus, an adequate theory must account for stalking of someone of the same sex as well as of the other sex, as does Cupach and Spitzberg's (2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002) relational goal pursuit theory.

Interactional/relational theory. According to Spitzberg and Cupach's (2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002) relational goal pursuit theory, there are three pathways through which a pursuer can acquire the goal to establish an intimate relationship with an object. The most common avenue occurs when the pursuer has previously shared a mutual relationship (not necessarily a romantic one) with the object. Another path can occur during a nominal interaction such as a chance meeting in a public location. A third path involves the pursuer developing a relational goal despite never having met the object. For example, a person might wish to increase intimacy with a celebrity or a person she or he has heard about through social contacts.

Cupach and Spitzberg (2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002) suggest that the goal of having a relationship with the object can be linked to a higher-order goal such as life happiness or self-worth. Some individuals are more prone to linking than others, and linkers have been found to ruminate more than non-linkers (McIntosh, Harlow, & Martin, 1995; McIntosh & Martin, 1992). Rumination involves repeated, intrusive, distressing, and unwanted thoughts resulting from failure to make progress in the attainment of an important goal (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2004; Cupach et al., 2000;

Martin & Tesser, 1989, 1996; Millar, Tesser, & Millar, 1988). Thus, according to Cupach and Spitzberg (2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002) individuals who tie higher-order goals like happiness to a specific relationship will dwell cognitively on that relationship and be more likely to engage in ORI and stalking. The more the person holds on to the relational goal, the more rumination intensifies, and consequently the more effort is expended to accomplish that goal even in the face of rejection (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2004; Cupach, et al., 2000).

Cupach and Spitzberg (2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002) theorize that rumination results from the failure to accomplish a relational goal and that pursuers therefore experience what Gottman (1994) termed “flooding” (p. 21). That is, they feel overwhelmed by negative emotions because an important goal is blocked. The emotional distress pursuers experience is a constant reminder of their failure to achieve their goal and this serves to perpetuate rumination. Thus, there is an incessant and self-perpetuating experience of negative emotions.

Another set of emotions that contributes to the experience of emotional flooding includes jealousy and possessiveness (Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002). White and Mullen (1989) define romantic jealousy as “a complex of thoughts, emotions, and actions that follows loss of or threat to self-esteem and/or the existence or quality of the romantic relationship” (p. 9). Cupach et al. (2000) propose that “jealousy accounts for much of the emotional undercurrent of ORI and stalking” (p. 141) because pursuers believe they are losing an imagined or desired relationship.

Possessiveness can also predispose a person to engage in unwanted pursuit and stalking. Possessiveness involves behaviors, attitudes, and feelings that are aimed at initiating and maintaining control over the behaviors of another (Peele & Brodsky, 1976). Cupach et al. (2000) suggest that jealousy could lead some people to attempt to take and maintain possession of their object of affection. A jealous person is likely to engage in activities aimed at protecting the real or perceived relationship from rivals. These activities can include stalking-like behaviors such as monitoring (e.g., keeping an eye on the person when the rival is around) and communicating with the rival (Bryson, 1991; Buss, 1988; Cupach et al., 2000).

Guilt, shame, and anger are another set of emotional responses that can occur when the desire for a relationship is not reciprocated (Cupach et al., 2000). These emotions may result from feelings of

jealousy or abandonment, or from the realization that one's pursuit behaviors have been inappropriate (Cupach et al., 2000). Lewis (1971) distinguishes shame and guilt in that shame involves the evaluation of the self whereas guilt involves evaluation of something the person has or has not done. With guilt, the self is not the object of negative evaluation. Cupach et al. (2000) suggest that those who experience guilt may be inclined to engage in persistent pursuit. Individuals who are rejected by those they pursue may feel as though they have committed a transgression against their object. They may feel they have been too persistent or have not done enough to win over the object's affection. Often, guilty individuals are preoccupied with their transgression (Tangney, 1995). Thus, guilt may be another source of rumination (Cupach et al., 2000). Consumed by a desire to repair the damage (Tangney, 1995), pursuers may become obsessed with establishing or reestablishing a particular relationship (Cupach et al., 2000).

Many individuals experience shame as more painful and severe than guilt (Tangney, 1995). Retzinger (1995) suggests that there are two types of shame - overt and covert. Overt shame may cause individuals to feel helpless, passive, and out of control in a situation. Covert shame may lead to obsessive thinking, speech, or perception. Direct rejection by a valued individual may cause shame (Retzinger, 1995). Cupach et al. (2000) state that those who engage in ORI and stalking are likely to have experienced such rejection and thereby manage their shame through anger and revenge directed at their object.

According to Cupach and Spitzberg (2004; Cupach, et al.; 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002), pursuers engage in rationalization as well as experience rumination and emotional flooding. Rationalization can pertain to pursuers' perception of the object, the object's behavior, and their own behavior. Cupach and Spitzberg (2004; Cupach, et al.; 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002) assert that rationalization contributes to obsessive pursuit by disinhibiting the pursuer. Initially, pursuers idealize their object. Despite the object's efforts to discourage the pursuit by withholding expression of positive feelings, the pursuer continues to focus on the object's positive aspects. The relational goal is thus reinforced and the pursuer may increase efforts to communicate with the object.

In addition to idealization of the object, pursuers often reinterpret the object's behavior as an indication of encouragement. They interpret the object's behavior favorably, sometimes inventing

explanations for why the object's neutrality is actually a sign of reciprocal interest (Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002; Tennov, 1979). The object may engage in indirect "face-saving" efforts to reject the pursuer which the pursuer will, in turn, misinterpret as a sign of encouragement and affection (Cupach et al., 2000; Emerson et al., 1998; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002).

Overly persistent pursuers may rationalize the appropriateness of their behavior by drawing on cultural scripts reinforced by the media and courtship rules that suggest persistence will eventually be rewarded (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002). For example, popular movies such as *There's Something About Mary* often portray a woman eventually falling in love with a man who persistently pursues her. The pursuer may also believe that the object is resisting in order to preserve an image of desirability and selectivity (Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002). Thus, pursuers may come to perceive their persistent pursuit as a way to overcome such resistance (Cupach et al., 2000). Cupach et al. (2000) argue that when pursuers engage in extreme forms of pursuit such as menacing harassment, they may rationalize the impact the behaviors have on their objects by downplaying the negative consequences. Pursuers may realize that their behavior affects the object negatively (e.g., annoyance, frustration) but feel it is justified by their good intentions (e.g., to achieve happiness, to have love) (Bratslavsky, Baumeister, & Sommer, 1998; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002). Such intentions prevent pursuers from realizing the extent to which the object feels threatened. Thus, rationalization serves to highlight pursuers' good intentions while downplaying the negative impact of their behavior on the object (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002).

Objects respond in a variety of ways to the pursuer's unwanted behaviors. These can include avoidance (e.g., ignoring the pursuer's behavior), direct confrontation (e.g., asking the pursuer to stop contacting them), retaliation (e.g., threatening the pursuer with physical or reputational harm), and seeking protection (e.g., asking law enforcement officials or friends to intervene) (Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002). Pursuers may rationalize the object's response and continue their pursuit. Some responses may elicit shame and anger in the pursuer which may fuel more aggressive pursuit behaviors (Cupach et al., 2000).

Cupach and Spitzberg's (2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002) relational goal pursuit theory takes into account pursuit of someone of the same sex as well as the other sex. It also accounts for the pursuit of any type of close relationship, including a friendship or a romantic relationship. In applying this theory, any combination of factors could lead to pursuit and stalking. For example, one person could experience extreme jealousy, possessiveness, and anger while another could experience shame and guilt. Regardless of the emotional pathway, both sets of emotions could fuel rumination, emotional flooding, and rationalization which, in turn, might lead to stalking.

Cupach and Spitzberg's (2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002) theory, however, is not without limitations. It does not take into account macro-level factors such as historical, cultural, social, community, and neighborhood influences or interpersonal factors such as peer or family influences (White et al., 2000). Another limitation is that the exact role of jealousy, possessiveness, anger, shame, and guilt in contributing to emotional flooding, rumination, and ORI is not specified in the theory. Further, their theory has not been tested empirically. Despite these limitations, Cupach and Spitzberg's (2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002) theory of ORI and stalking represents an attempt to identify the process through which a series of interpersonal interactions can lead to unwanted pursuit and stalking. Their theory provides the basis for the model of unwanted pursuit and stalking that I tested in this study.

Predictors of Unwanted Pursuit and Stalking

Recent research has investigated potential predictors of unwanted pursuit and stalking. Some factors that have predicted unwanted pursuit include attachment insecurity (Davis et al., 2000; Dutton-Greene & Winstead, 2000; Spitzberg, 2000), previous criminality (Meloy, 1996; Mullen & Pathé, 1994), rape empathy (Spitzberg & Cupach, 2001), love styles (Sinclair & Frieze, 2000; Spitzberg, 2000), need for control (Davis et al., 2000), and negative family-of-origin experiences (Langhinrichsen-Rohling & Rohling, 2000). Although researchers, to date, have not investigated specifically the role of shame, guilt, emotional flooding, and rumination in predicting unwanted pursuit and stalking, there is some empirical support for Cupach et al.'s (2000) assertion that jealousy, possessiveness, and anger play a role in unwanted pursuit and stalking.

Spitzberg and Cupach (1999) conducted a study of ORI perpetration with 112 female and 66 male undergraduate students ($M = 21$ years). Fifty-eight percent of the participants were White, 13% Hispanic, 10% Asian, 7% African American, and 11% "Other." They did not report student sexual orientation. They found a small but significant positive correlation between general jealousy and ORI pursuit but not between general jealousy and ORI aggression. They also found that possessiveness was significantly correlated with the ORI pursuit and aggression factors. Although the effect sizes were in the small to moderate range, the results lend support to Spitzberg and Cupach's hypotheses that jealousy and possessiveness are positively related to perpetration of ORI. In contrast, Spitzberg and Cupach conducted a series of multiple regression analyses and the results indicated that feelings of jealousy and possessiveness do not reliably predict ORI pursuit or ORI aggression. They did find, however, that behavioral responses to jealousy such as evasion (e.g., giving their partner the silent treatment) and restriction (e.g., tried to prevent their partner from seeing a rival) were consistent predictors of ORI pursuit and ORI aggression.

Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. (2000) conducted a study of pursuit after the breakup of a relationship and found that among those who had ended the relationship (i.e., relationship dissolvers), total pursuit behavior scores were predicted by the perception that the ex-partner was jealous and high in a possessive-dependent love style. Among those who had not initiated the breakup (i.e., breakup sufferers), higher levels of possessiveness predicted total pursuit behavior scores. Jealousy was not significantly correlated with level of unwanted pursuit perpetration among relationship dissolvers or among breakup sufferers. In a regression analysis of data from relationship dissolvers however, perceived jealousy of the ex-partner was a significant predictor of unwanted pursuit after relationship breakup. Self-reported jealousy was not a significant predictor of unwanted pursuit among breakup sufferers. Sex was not a significant predictor in any of the analyses.

Davis et al. (2000) conducted two studies ($N_1 = 169$; $N_2 = 203$) of the correlates of self-reported "stalking-like behaviors" (p. 407) among college students after the breakup of a relationship. The modal age of participants for both samples was 19 years. Davis et al. did not report the race/ethnicity or sexual orientation of their participants. Five items were used to assess an anger-

jealousy-obsessiveness cluster (anger, jealousy, and obsessiveness were not assessed independently). A path analysis revealed that anger-jealousy was significant in predicting the degree of unwanted pursuit.

Dye and Davis (2003) examined the role of breakup anger-jealousy in the perpetration of stalking with a sample of 338 undergraduates (251 females, 87 males) who had recently experienced a relationship breakup. They administered a measure of breakup anger-jealousy which consisted of five items that assess angry and jealous reactions to a relationship breakup. These items included angry, upset, jealous, let down, and vengeful. Dye and Davis found that stalking was significantly correlated with breakup anger-jealousy. Path analyses revealed that degree of anger-jealousy associated with the breakup contributed significantly to the prediction of stalking. Dye and Davis state that breakup anger-jealousy appears to have an important role in stalking because the results from their study indicate that an angry-jealous reaction to a breakup mediates the relationship between stalking and relationship passion and need for control.

Similarly, in their study of courtship stalking, Sinclair and Frieze (2000) found that for women, an angry as well as a vengeful reaction to being rejected correlated positively with all stalking factors: approach, surveillance, intimidation, hurting oneself, mild aggression, violence. For men, an angry reaction correlated with surveillance, intimidation, hurting oneself, and mild aggression. A vengeful reaction correlated with all factors except hurting oneself.

In an effort to identify characteristics of stalkers, Roberts (2002) investigated women's experiences of stalking by ex-partners after the breakup of a heterosexual relationship. The sample consisted of 305 female undergraduate students. All participants were White and their mean age was 24.63 years ($SD = 6.17$). One hundred and five of the women (34%) met the criteria for stalking victimization. These victims were more likely to report that their former partners were jealous of their relationships with others than participants who had been harassed or not stalked at all.

Similarly, Del Ben (2002) developed a typology of male stalkers based on female victims' perceptions of the stalkers' motivation (love/hostility vs. control/freedom) and behaviors. Three hundred and ninety-six female college students participated in the study ($M = 19.0$ years). Ninety one percent of the participants were White. Del Ben did not report the race/ethnicity of the remaining participants. One hundred and eight (28%) participants reported being stalked. Compared to a control

group of 288 females who did not report being stalked, victims were more likely to report that the stalker exhibited higher levels of jealousy when they first met and higher levels of jealousy when they were most happy (presumably pertaining to the period when the relationship, be it platonic or romantic, was intact).

Spitzberg (2000) examined the role of love styles in predicting ORI with a sample of 102 female and 64 male undergraduate students ($M = 21.36$ years). Among his participants, 64% were Caucasian, 8% Asian-American, 7% Mexican-American/Hispanic, and nearly 2% Native American. He did not report the sexual orientation of his participants. A love style is a type of love individuals experience in relationships. Lee (1976, as cited by Spitzberg, 2000) identified six love styles which include Eros (i.e., a passionate romantic love), Ludus (i.e., an exploitative type love), Storge (i.e., platonic love), Mania (i.e., addictive, dependent, possessive style of love), Pragma (i.e., a rational style of love), and Agape (i.e., an idealistic, selfless love style). Spitzberg (2000) found that a manic love style was significantly related to two ORI factors, threat and hyper-intimacy.

In conclusion, research with college students indicates, in general, that jealousy, possessiveness, and anger are related to unwanted pursuit and stalking. No research that I am aware of has investigated the role of shame, guilt, emotional flooding, or rumination in unwanted pursuit and stalking. In the current study, I assessed how participants' experiences of jealousy, possessiveness, anger, shame, guilt, emotional flooding, and rumination combine to elicit unwanted pursuit and stalking.

It is important to note that much of the research on unwanted pursuit and stalking has been conducted with college students with the majority of them approximately 20 years of age, heterosexual, and White. Thus, much of what is known about unwanted pursuit and stalking may not apply to individuals who do not attend college, are older, are lesbian, gay or bisexual, or have different racial/ethnic backgrounds. In addition, numerous researchers have failed to assess and/or report participants' sexual orientation (e.g., Cupach & Spitzberg, 2000; Davis et al., 2000; Fisher et al. 2000) and race/ethnicity (e.g., Davis et al., 2000; Fisher et al., 2000; Hall, 1998, Purcell et al., 2001). This limits the amount of information that a meta-analysis could reveal about the nature of stalking and unwanted pursuit within and across different populations.

Nonetheless, existing research indicates that young people between the ages of 18 and 29 are at greater risk of being stalked than older individuals (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) found that 52% of stalking victims were between 18 and 29 years old when the stalking began. The lifestyles of both female and male college students may put them in more social and relational situations that increase the likelihood of their engaging in unwanted pursuit and stalking as well as the chance of becoming the object of unwanted pursuit and stalking (Fisher et al., 2000). Thus, it remains important to investigate unwanted pursuit and stalking among college students.

Hypothesized Model

The purpose of my dissertation was to develop and test a structural model of unwanted pursuit and stalking with a sample of undergraduate college students. Based on Cupach and Spitzberg's (2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002) theory of ORI and stalking, I developed a model (see Figure 1) in which I hypothesized that those who report experiencing higher levels of jealousy, possessiveness, anger, shame, and guilt after a breakup would also report more unwanted pursuit and stalking. I expected these relationships would operate through the mediation of two constructs, rumination and emotional flooding, that would predict pursuit behavior.

I expected the following relationships to occur:

1. Jealousy will be:
 - a. positively associated with rumination
 - b. positively associated with emotional flooding
2. Possessiveness will be:
 - a. positively associated with rumination
 - b. positively associated with emotional flooding
3. Anger will be:
 - a. positively associated with rumination
 - b. positively associated with emotional flooding
4. Shame will be:
 - a. positively associated with rumination
 - b. positively associated with emotional flooding

5. Guilt will be:

- a. positively associated with rumination
- b. positively associated with emotional flooding

6. Unwanted pursuit will be:

- a. positively associated with rumination
- b. positively associated with emotional flooding

Figure 1. Hypothesized Mediation Model of Unwanted Pursuit and Stalking

CHAPTER 3: METHOD

Participants

Participants in both the pilot and final studies included undergraduate students 18 years of age or older who had difficulty letting go of a partner of the same or other sex after the breakup of a romantic relationship. Students were drawn from introductory psychology classes at the University of Rhode Island (URI) and received partial course credit for their participation.

Pilot study. Five hundred and three students (320 females, 163 males, 20 sex not reported) participated in the pilot study. I deleted data from four participants (1 female, 2 males, 1 sex not reported). One female and one male participant did not meet one of the criteria for participating in the study because they indicated in a space provided for feedback on the questionnaire that they had not had a difficult time letting go of someone after the breakup of a relationship. One participant reported having difficulty reading the questions on her computer screen and another indicated that he was not answering the questions about one specific relationship. I deleted data from seven additional participants (four females, three males) because they had outlying scores on one or more of the study variables (described in more detail in the Analyses section). The final sample for the pilot study ($N = 492$) included 315 females (64%), 158 males (32.1%), and 19 individuals who did not report their sex (3.9%).

Participant's ages ranged from 18 to 42 ($M = 18.89$, $SD = 1.55$). Eighty-six percent ($N = 423$) were Caucasian (non-Hispanic/Latino)/White, 4.9% ($N = 24$) African-American/Black, 1.8% ($N = 9$) Asian American/Pacific Islander, 1.6% ($N = 8$) Native American, 1.4% ($N = 7$) bi/multiracial. Twenty-one participants did not report their race (4.3%). The majority of participants indicated that they were heterosexual (94.3%, 0.8% questioning, 0.6% bisexual, 0.4% gay man, 0.0% lesbian, 3.7% sexual identity not reported). Among female participants, 99% ($N = 310$) of the female participants reported that their partner was a male. Of the 155 male participants, 96.8% ($N = 150$) reported that their partner was a female.

Final study. Students enrolled in the introductory psychology courses at the URI from which I drew my participants could participate in research in order to fulfill a course requirement. Completing

my questionnaire online was most likely more attractive than the alternate activities that were available (e.g., reading and answering questions about a research article). Further, one student wrote in a space for feedback “[The questionnaire] did not apply to me specifically, because I was on the other side of having a hard time of letting someone go in a breakup of a romantic relationship.” Therefore, I suspected that a number of students who participated in the study did not meet the requirement of having had difficulty letting go of a relationship partner at some point in their life. Consequently, for the final study I developed an alternative questionnaire for individuals who had never had such difficulty. Thus, students could choose to complete one of two questionnaires; one if they had *ever* had difficulty letting go and another if they had *never* had such difficulty. I did this so that students who had not had difficulty letting go of a relationship partner would still be able to participate in my study for the course credit they needed. Three hundred and fifty-four students participated in the final study. Sixty-six students (18.6%; 39 females, 25 males, 3 sex not reported) completed the alternative questionnaire. Two hundred and eighty-eight (81.4%; 227 females, 60 males, 1 sex not reported) students completed the questionnaire for those who had had difficulty letting go of a relationship partner.

The ages of the students in the final sample ranged from 18 to 59 ($M = 18.78$, $SD = 2.68$). The racial composition of the sample was 91.7% ($N = 264$) Caucasian (non-Hispanic/Latino)/White, 3.1% ($N = 9$) Asian-American/Pacific Islander, 2.8% ($N = 8$) African-American/Black, 1.7% ($N = 5$) bi/multiracial, and 1.4% ($N = 4$) Native American. Participants were instructed to “check all that apply” from six options when reporting their race. Therefore, the percents sum to more than 100%. The sample was predominantly heterosexual (97.2% heterosexual, 1.7% bisexual, 0.3% other, 0.7% sexual identity not reported). When asked their partner’s sex, 99.1% ($N = 225$) of the females indicated that their partner was a male and 100% ($N = 60$) of the males indicated that their partner was a female.

Measures

I adapted some measures for use in this study and created others. To assure the measures assess the constructs as theorized, two experts in the field of ORI and stalking (W. R. Cupach, personal communication, July, 24, 2002, July 31, 2002, September 18, 2002; B. H. Spitzberg, personal communication, July 29, 2002, July 31, 2002, August 9, 2002) reviewed and provided feedback on the

measures of jealousy, possessiveness, anger, shame, guilt, rumination, and emotional flooding. A statement at the top of the questionnaire reminded participants that their responses to all questions would remain anonymous, that there was no way their answers could be linked to them personally, and to keep in mind as they answered the questions that there are no right or wrong answers.

Unwanted pursuit and stalking. To assess unwanted pursuit and stalking, I administered a modified version of the Unwanted Pursuit Behavior Inventory (UPBI; Palarea & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1998; see Appendix A). The original scale includes 27 items. Thirteen items measure mild pursuit (e.g., leave the person phone messages or hang-up calls; send/leave the person letters, emails, faxes, pages, gifts). The remaining 14 items assess severe pursuit (e.g., steal items from the person; threaten the person with a weapon). In the original measure, one item asked if participants had ever threatened to harm/kill the person. Because making a threat to harm is less severe than making a threat to kill, I separated this item into two items to assess whether participants had ever threatened to harm their ex-partner or threatened to kill her or him. The modified scale, therefore, includes 14 mild and 14 severe pursuit items.

The response options on the original scale included five options: more than daily, daily, weekly, monthly, and less than monthly. To assess the frequency of each unwanted behavior more specifically, I modified these options. For the revised scale, participants indicated how often they engaged in each unwanted contact behavior using a 5-point Likert-type scale which ranges from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*over 5 times*). Scores can range from 28 to 140. A high score indicates that the participant reported engaging in many pursuit behaviors.

With a sample of 282 predominantly White (91.8%) undergraduates, Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. (2000) reported a coefficient alpha of .81 for their original scale.

Shame, guilt, anger. To assess shame, guilt, and anger in the pilot study, I administered a modified version of the Harder Personal Feelings Questionnaire (PFQ2; Harder & Zalma, 1990; see Appendix B). For this measure, participants indicated how often they experienced a range of emotions such as embarrassment, depression, and enjoyment during the time they were having difficulty letting go of their former relationship partner. The original PFQ2 includes 22 items. Ten items assess shame, six measure guilt, and six assess unrelated emotions (e.g., mild happiness, depression). I changed the

item, “worry about hurting or injuring someone” to “feeling worried about hurting or injuring my ex-partner” because I wanted to assess guilt experienced by pursuers as it relates to their ex-partners specifically. I added another item, “worried about hurting or injuring someone who was in the way of my relationship with my ex-partner” because some stalkers threaten to assault, attempt to assault, and/or assault individuals perceived to be blocking the attainment of their desired relationship with the object (Batza & Taylor, 1999; Meloy, 1996; Palarea, Zona, Lane, & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1999; Perez, 1993). The PFQ2 was not constructed to assess anger although it includes one anger-related item, “rage.” To assess participants’ feelings of anger during the time they were having difficulty letting go of their ex-partner, I added five additional items (i.e., angry, mad, hostile, furious, annoyed). These items represent an array of anger-related feelings that participants may have experienced after the breakup of a relationship.

The revised scale includes 28 items. Ten items measure shame, six assess guilt, six measure anger, and six assess unrelated emotions. Respondents indicated on a 5-point Likert-type scale how often they experienced each emotion (1 = *never* to 5 = *continuously or almost continuously*). Participants’ scores on the shame subscale can range from 10 to 50, on the guilt subscale they can range from 6 to 30, and for the anger subscale they can range from 6 to 30. High scores on each subscale indicate that participants reported frequently experiencing the particular emotion (i.e., shame, guilt, anger) during the time they were having difficulty letting go of a former partner.

Harder and Zalma (1990) administered the PFQ2 to a sample of 26 female and 37 male undergraduates ($M = 18.46$ years). They did not report information on participants’ race/ethnicity. A principal components analysis revealed a two-factor structure supporting the two constructs of shame and guilt. Eight shame items loaded on a shame factor. Five guilt items and two shame items (i.e., self-consciousness, feeling humiliated) loaded on the guilt factor. One shame item (i.e., feeling “stupid”) was complex in that it loaded .40 on the guilt factor and .68 on the shame factor.

Jealousy. To my knowledge, no measure exists that assesses jealousy as experienced by someone who had a difficult time letting go of a former relationship partner. Therefore, I created a 5-item measure of jealousy for use in this study (see Appendix C). The measure includes five questions about the degree of jealousy experienced during the time respondents were having difficulty letting go

of their former partner (e.g., how often did you feel jealous, how jealous would your ex-partner say you were during that time). Participants responded to each question using a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*very often*). Scores on this scale can range from 5 to 25. A high score indicates a great deal of jealousy experienced during the time the participant was having difficulty letting go of a former relationship partner. In an effort to measure the construct of jealousy more accurately and improve internal consistency, I added a sixth item, “Did your jealousy create problems between you and your ex-partner after the breakup?” for the final study. With the additional question, scores can range from 6 to 30.

Possessiveness. I used a modified version of Pinto and Hollandsworth’s (1984) 21-item Possessiveness Scale to assess possessiveness in a former intimate relationship (see Appendix D). The wording of the original questionnaire is in the present tense. I changed it to the past tense so that participants could report on their feelings of possessiveness in a past intimate relationship. Two items in the original measure are geared towards heterosexual romantic relationships (i.e., “I felt secure about our relationship even though my partner made new friends of the opposite sex,” “I felt guilty about making new friends of the opposite sex.”). I added two items appropriate for individuals reporting on a same-sex relationship by changing the word “opposite” to “same” (e.g., “I felt secure about our relationship even though my partner made new friends of the same sex,” “I felt guilty about making new friends of the same sex”). Thus, the modified scale consists of 23 items. Using a 5-point Likert-type scale with ratings from 1 (*never or rarely*) to 5 (*almost always or always*), participants indicated the extent to which they thought, acted, or felt a particular way in certain described situations. For example, one item states “When we were apart I felt unloved and lonely” for which participants indicated how much they felt this way. Scores on the measure can range from 23 to 115. A high score indicated the participant often felt possessive or acted in a possessive way towards her or his partner while the relationship was intact.

Pinto and Hollandsworth (1984) conducted a validation study of their measure with 290 undergraduate and graduate students. The mean age of the sample was 24.3. They reported neither the percentage of women and men in their sample nor the race/ethnicity of their participants. A factor analysis of the data yielded a six-factor structure. They labeled the factors insecurity, confidence, trust,

jealousy, independence, and freedom. They obtained Spearman-Brown and Kuder-Richardson reliability coefficients of .85 and .80, respectively. Spitzberg and Cupach (1999) used this scale with a sample of undergraduate students to assess possessiveness as a predictor of ORI and found a coefficient alpha of .89.

Rumination. For this study, I adapted Trapnell and Campbell's (1999) measure of rumination from their Rumination-Reflection Questionnaire (see Appendix E). Twelve of the 24 items in their original questionnaire assess rumination (i.e., "neurotic self-attentiveness," p. 287). Trapnell and Campbell's rumination items assess the general tendency to ruminate (e.g., "I often find myself reevaluating something I've done"). I modified the 12 rumination items so that the questions asked are specific to experiences of rumination during the time the participant had difficulty letting go of an ex-partner. For example, one revised item states, "I often ruminated or dwelled on thoughts about the relationship I wanted with my ex-partner." Participants indicated the extent to which they agreed with each statement using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Scale scores can range from 12 to 60. A high score on this measure indicates that the participant experienced a great deal of rumination during the period of time in which she or he had difficulty letting go of a former relationship partner.

Using this measure, Trapnell and Campbell collected data from five samples of undergraduates from introductory psychology classes ($N = 1,137$). All samples were approximately 60% female. They reported that 60% to 75% of each sample was of European ancestry and 25% to 40% were of East Asian ancestry. Participants' ages ranged from 17 to 59 with 90% between 17 and 25 years. For the five samples combined, they found an average coefficient alpha of .90 for their 12-item rumination subscale.

Emotional flooding. To my knowledge, there are currently no existing measures of emotional flooding experienced while having difficulty letting go of a relationship partner. Participants completed a 6-item scale I developed for the present study (see Appendix F). They rated how well the six statements describe their emotional experiences during the time they were having difficulty letting go of their former partner (e.g., "I felt overwhelmed with bad feelings about the situation with my ex-partner"). Participants indicated their responses using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*not at*

all) to 5 (*completely*). Scores on this measure can range from 5 to 25. A high score indicates that the participant often experienced emotional flooding during the time she or he was having difficulty letting go of a former relationship partner.

Socially desirable responding. Paulhus (1991) defines socially desirable responding as “a tendency to give answers that make the respondent look good” (p. 17). Research suggests there are two types of socially desirable responding (Paulhus, 1984, 1986). Some participants engage in impression management by answering questions in such a way as to create a more positive image of themselves (Paulhus, 1991). Self-deceptive positivity, on the other hand, occurs when participants answer questions in an honest but overly positive manner (Paulhus, 1991). For the study, I was interested in controlling for responses that were intentionally incorrect. Thus, I used a social desirability measure that assesses impression management. The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (SDS; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) includes 33 true-false items that describe behaviors that are either desirable but uncommon (e.g., “I never resent being asked to return a favor”) or undesirable but common (e.g., “I like to gossip at times”) (Paulhus, 1991). Paulhus (1984) found that the SDS primarily measures impression management.

A number of researchers have developed shortened versions of the SDS (e.g., Ramanaiah & Martin, 1980; Reynolds, 1982; Strahan & Gerbasi, 1972). I used a short form of the SDS (Form X1) developed by Strahan and Gerbasi (1972; see Appendix G). This version includes 10 items from the original SDS. Participants’ scores can range from 10 to 20. After five of the items are reverse-scored, a higher score indicates a greater tendency to respond in a way that makes the participant look good. Using confirmatory factor analysis, Fischer and Fick (1993) compared eight short forms of the SDS and the standard form (i.e., the original version). They found that Form X1 yielded the best fitting model when compared to the structural models hypothesized in the other scales. Form X1 also correlated highly with the standard form ($r = .96$) and internal consistency was high ($\alpha = .88$).

Other Materials

Recruitment materials. Appendix H includes the announcement that I used to solicit participants from undergraduate psychology courses at URI for the pilot study. It invites those who have had difficulty letting go of someone of the same or other sex after the breakup of a romantic

relationship to complete the questionnaire online. By recruiting individuals who had a difficult time with a breakup, I expected to obtain data on a range of pursuit behaviors from individuals who did not engage in any of the pursuit behaviors to those who engaged in many of them. Thus, I ensured more variability in the scores on the measures than if I had recruited individuals who have engaged in unwanted pursuit or stalking of a former partner after the breakup of a relationship only. In addition, some individuals may not label their behavior as pursuit or stalking. Such individuals are more likely to participate in a study about having difficulty with a relationship breakup. Use of an online questionnaire, as opposed to administering the questionnaire in a group setting (e.g., during class), provided participants with assured anonymity which may have encouraged them to be more honest in their responses, thereby reducing socially desirable responding (Paulhus, 1991). In the pilot study, in fact, one student wrote in a space provided for feedback “I thought it was a very good survey, especially the fact that it is anonymous [sic] because I felt as though I could answer [sic] each question openly and freely and that I wouldn't be judged by my answers [sic].”

The announcement for the final study that appeared on the introductory psychology website recruited individuals at least 18 years old who had experienced a breakup of a relationship (see Appendix I). Once they read this announcement, they then went to a webpage with the consent form. To indicate their consent to participate, participants clicked on a link that said “I have read the consent form, understand the risks and benefits, and agree to participate.” They were then taken to a webpage where they were asked to indicate whether they had ever or never had difficulty with the breakup of a relationship. Once they clicked on the appropriate link, participants were taken to the webpage with the introduction to the study.

Introduction to the study. Those who indicated that they had experienced difficulty after a breakup then read an introduction to the study that instructed them to answer questions about their most recent experience having a difficult time letting go of a relationship partner (see Appendix J). Those who had never experienced such difficulty read a slightly different version of the introduction that asked them to report on their most recent relationship breakup. When they had finished reading the introduction, they clicked on a link that took them to the appropriate questionnaire. The phrasing of the

introduction was based in part on that developed by Davis et al. (2000) who investigated stalking after the termination of a relationship with a sample of undergraduate students.

Demographics. The demographic section of the questionnaire assessed participants' age, sex, race, sexual identity, and the sex of their former partner (see Appendix K).

Procedure

I recruited participants from large introductory psychology courses at URI. The announcement for the study appeared on the course websites. Students accessed the questionnaire via a link to a separate web page provided in the announcement. Once students completed the questionnaires, they clicked on a button to submit their responses. For the pilot study, the data were sent directly to my email address. For the final study, the data were first stored in a serverside database and then transferred to a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Data Screening

As recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (1996), I screened the data prior to conducting the analyses. I examined social desirability, jealousy, possessiveness, anger, shame, guilt, rumination, emotional flooding, mild pursuit, and severe pursuit for the accuracy of data entry, missing values, and fit between distributions and assumptions for multivariate analyses. I examined the pilot data and final data separately. Using an expectation maximization method in SPSS (Version 11.0), I replaced no more than seven missing values for any one variable in the dataset for the pilot study (1.4% missing data rate) and no more than eight missing values in the final study dataset (2.8% missing data rate). Normality, linearity, and kurtosis of distributions were within acceptable limits for all variables except severe pursuit. The distribution for severe pursuit was highly positively skewed and kurtotic in both samples. None of the transformations I performed (i.e., square root, logarithmic, inverse) reduced skewness and kurtosis to normal or near-normal levels (i.e., equal to or below 1.0 for skewness and 2.0 for kurtosis). Very few participants in either the pilot or the final study reported engaging in severe pursuit behaviors and those who did report them indicated that they did so infrequently. Scores on severe pursuit could range from 9 to 40 and the mean severe pursuit score for the final sample was 9.33 ($SD = 1.48$). Thus, I used mild pursuit as the only dependent variable in the final study.

I examined the pilot data ($N = 496$) for univariate and multivariate outliers. Using the criteria of $z > 3.29$ suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell (1996), I deleted data from seven participants (four females, three males) because their scores were univariate outliers. One female and one male had extreme scores on the shame/guilt measure, two males had extreme scores on the possessiveness scale, one female had an extreme score on the rumination measure, and two females had extreme scores on the pursuit inventory. I identified no multivariate outliers through Mahalanobis distance with $p < .001$. The final sample size for the pilot study was 492 (315 females, 158 males, and 19 participants who did not report their sex).

Three hundred and five students (238 females, 64 males, 3 sex not reported) participated in the final study. I deleted data from 17 participants (11 females, 4 males, 2 sex not reported) for the

following reasons. One participant who did not report her/his sex responded only to the first 10 items in the questionnaire and eight (5 females, 2 males, 1 sex unknown) provided questionable responses (e.g., responses had a suspicious numeric pattern) or did not meet one of the two requirements for the study (i.e., must be at least 18 years old and have had difficulty letting go of someone after a breakup). I deleted data from four females and two males because their scores on the pursuit measure were univariate outliers. I also deleted data from two females because they had outlying scores on the rumination scale. There were no multivariate outliers. After data screening, the sample for the final study included data from 288 participants (227 females, 60 males, 1 sex not reported).

Measure Development

Factor identification. To identify the factors underlying each measure and to assess the integrity of the scales for use in the structural analyses, I conducted principal components analyses (PCA). I used oblique Varimax rotation because it was likely that the factors would be somewhat correlated. In addition, I assessed reliability of the factors based on a combination of component saturation, sample size criteria (Guadagnoli & Velicer, 1988), and examination of scree plots. Guadagnoli and Velicer (1988) recommend that components with four or more loadings above an absolute value of .60 are reliable, regardless of sample size. Components with approximately 10 or more low (close to .40) loadings are reliable if the sample size is greater than 150. They recommend that components with three or fewer loadings not be interpreted unless the sample size is 300 or larger. Stevens (2002), however, suggests that any component with at least three loadings above .80 will be reliable (presumably regardless of sample size). Stevens argues that obtaining a factor with only a few high loadings indicates that the factor is as close to being variable-specific as possible. Before creating scale scores, I deleted complex items (i.e., those that loaded .40 or more on more than one factor) and items that loaded poorly (i.e., less than .40).

Unwanted Pursuit Behavior Inventory. For both the pilot and final studies, the PCAs I conducted on the data for the 24-item UPBI revealed a two-factor solution reflecting mild and severe pursuit. Palarea and Langhinrichsen-Rohling (1998) identified mild and severe pursuit behaviors prior to administering the scale. The factor structure that emerged from the PCAs in both the pilot and final studies supports their differentiation between mild and severe pursuit behaviors.

Results from the PCA on the pilot data yielded 13 mild pursuit items that loaded on the Mild Pursuit factor and nine severe pursuit items that loaded on the Severe Pursuit factor. Mild Pursuit accounted for 17% of the variance and Severe Pursuit accounted for an additional 12%. For the final data, 11 items loaded on the Mild Pursuit factor and nine items loaded on the Severe Pursuit factor. Table 1 presents the loadings on the Mild Pursuit and Severe Pursuit factors for the final study. As I stated previously, because severe pursuit scores were highly skewed and kurtotic I used scores on the Mild Pursuit factor as the only dependent variable for all analyses in the final study.

Shame/Guilt/Anger Scale. I conducted a PCA of the shame, guilt, and anger items on the pilot data and a two-factor solution emerged. The first factor (the Anger factor) contained all six anger items and one shame item, “helpless, paralyzed.” The second factor, labeled Shame/Guilt, contained seven shame and five guilt items. The Anger factor accounted for 33% of the variance and the Shame/Guilt factor accounted for an additional 10%. It thus appears that the items intended to measure shame and guilt did not successfully distinguish between the two constructs. Further, the guilt items I modified to address worry about injuring or hurting the ex-partner or someone did not load on either factor.

In an attempt to better distinguish between the constructs of shame and guilt, I revised the measure for the final study. I retained eight items from the Harder Personal Feelings Questionnaire (PFQ2; Harder & Zalma, 1990) that loaded on the Shame/Guilt factor. I made slight modifications to the wording of some PFQ2 items (e.g., I changed “embarrassment” to “embarrassed” and “sadness” to “sad”). I omitted the items I had included in the pilot study regarding worry about hurting an ex-partner and worry about hurting someone in the way of the participants’ relationship with the ex-partner. In place of these two items, I included the guilt item “worried.” In addition to the items drawn from the PFQ2, I included six items that I modified from Hoblitzelle’s (1982; cited in Harder & Zalma, 1990) Adapted Shame and Guilt Scale (ASGS) including “you had no morals,” “guilty,” and “ashamed.” I also included six items based on items in Cook’s (1988) Internalized Shame Scale (ISS) such as “inadequate,” “full of self-doubt,” and “you were not quite good enough.” The revised Shame/Guilt/Anger Scale contained 13 shame items, 8 guilt items, 5 anger items (I inadvertently left the item “annoyed” out of the measure in the final study), and three unrelated emotions (i.e., sad, relieved,

Table 1

Factor Structure of the Unwanted Pursuit Behavior Inventory for the Final Sample (N = 288)

Item	Mild Pursuit	Severe Pursuit
Show up in places where you thought your ex-partner might be (M)	.71	
Unexpectedly visit your ex-partner at school/work/some other public place (M)	.63	
Go out of your way to run into your ex-partner "unexpectedly" (M)	.66	
Leave your ex-partner phone messages or hang-up calls (M)	.60	
Engage your ex-partner in a phone conversation (M)	.67	
Unexpectedly visit your ex-partner at her/his home (M)	.53	
Engage your ex-partner in a conversation in person (M)	.64	
Ask friends for information about your ex-partner (M)	.59	
Send/leave your ex-partner letters, emails, faxes, pages, gifts, cards, etc. (M)	.56	
Give your ex-partner items (e.g., letters, gifts) in person (M)	.51	
Wait outside of your ex-partner's home/work/school (M)	.42	
Contact your ex-partner's family/friends without her/his permission (M)		
Talk with your ex-partner in an internet chat room (M)		
Follow your ex-partner (M)		
Cause harm to someone close to your ex-partner or to her/his pet (S)		.78
Threaten to harm someone close to your ex-partner or her/his pet (S)		.83
Physically injure your ex-partner (S)		.64
Threaten to kill your ex-partner (S)		.66
Kidnap your ex-partner or hold your ex-partner against her/his will (S)		.65
Threaten to kill someone close to your ex-partner or her/his pet (S)		.50
Threaten to release information that would be harmful to your ex-partner (S)		
Steal items from your ex-partner (S)		
Release information that was harmful to your ex-partner (S)		
Cause damage to your ex-partner's property (e.g., home, car, etc.) (S)		.77
Threaten to harm your ex-partner (S)		.67
Make vague or implied threats to your ex-partner (S)		.51
Threaten your ex-partner with a weapon (S)		
Force your ex-partner to engage in sexual contact after the breakup (S)		

Note. An M indicates a mild pursuit item and an S indicates a severe pursuit item identified by Palarea and Langhinrichsen-Rohling (1998). To improve interpretability of the table, I did not include complex items or loadings for items that loaded poorly (below .40).

happy). Refer to Appendix L for the revised measure of shame, guilt, and anger I administered in the final study.

Results from the PCA of the shame/guilt/anger scale for the final data yielded a three-factor solution (see Table 2). The first factor contained eight shame and five guilt items and I labeled this the Shame factor. Three shame and three guilt items loaded on the second factor and I labeled this the Guilt factor. The third factor, the Anger factor, was comprised of all five anger items (e.g., angry, mad, hostile, full of rage, furious). Results from the PCA indicate that participants distinguish between the items that load on these three factors. The first and second factors do not assess shame and guilt as conceptualized by various researchers (e.g., Cook, 1988; Harder & Zalma, 1990; Hoblitzelle, 1982) but they were distinct and loadings were generally high so I retained them for analyses. The Shame factor accounted for 38% of the variance, the Guilt factor for 8%, and Anger an additional 6%.

Jealousy and Possessiveness Scales. Pinto and Hollandsworth (1984) identified six factors in the data for their measure of possessiveness (although they did not report the specific items that loaded on each factor). One of the factors they labeled “Jealousy.” For the pilot data, I combined participants’ data on the measures of jealousy and possessiveness and conducted a PCA in order to identify the items in both measures that load on the jealousy and possessiveness factors. A three-factor solution emerged in which all 10 of the reverse-scored items loaded on the first factor, 10 out of the 13 remaining items loaded on the second factor, and all five jealousy items loaded on the third factor. None of the possessiveness items loaded on the Jealousy factor. The first possessiveness factor accounted for 33% of the variance, the second possessiveness factor accounted for 10%, and the Jealousy factor accounted for an additional 6%. I retained all items from the possessiveness and jealousy measures for use in the final study.

A PCA of the jealousy and possessiveness items with the final data revealed a two-factor solution. Fifteen of the possessiveness items loaded on the first factor (labeled Possessiveness). The six jealousy items plus one item from the possessiveness scale (i.e., “When we were apart I worried that my partner would find someone new”) loaded on the second factor (labeled Jealousy). The Possessiveness factor accounted for 24% of the variance and the Jealousy factor accounted for an

Table 2

Factor Structure of the Shame/Guilt/Anger Scale for the Final Sample (N = 288).

Item	Factor		
	Anger	Guilt	Shame
Angry (A)	.83		
Mad (A)	.83		
Furious (A)	.80		
Full of rage (A)	.78		
Hostile (A)	.60		
Guilty (G)		.75	
You deserved criticism (G)		.74	
Ashamed (S)		.70	
You were a bad person (S)		.66	
You handled things poorly (G)		.66	
Foolish (S)		.64	
You had said or done something inappropriate (G)		.62	
People looked down on you (S)		.60	
Childish (S)		.59	
Embarrassed (S)		.54	
Afraid that your faults would be revealed to others (S)		.53	
Like you had no morals (G)		.53	
Feelings of blushing (S)		.43	
Down on yourself (S)			.80
Depressed (S)			.72
Full of self-doubt (S)			.71
You were not quite good enough (S)			.68
Regret (G)			.61
Remorseful (G)			.59
Worried (G)			.44
Stupid (S)			

Note. An S indicates an item that assesses shame, a G indicates a guilt item, and an A indicates an anger item. To improve interpretability, I did not include complex items or loadings for items that loaded poorly (below .40).

additional 11%. The factor structure of the measures of jealousy and possessiveness with the final data is presented in Table 3.

Rumination Scale. A one-factor solution emerged from a PCA of the 12-item measure of pursuit-specific rumination conducted on the pilot data. All but one item loaded above .40. These 11 items accounted for 42% of the variance. The coefficient alpha for these items was .87. A PCA of the final data revealed a one-factor solution, as well (see Table 4). The factor loadings for all 12 items were above .40. These items accounted for 40% of the variance and the coefficient alpha was .85.

Emotional Flooding Scale. A PCA conducted on the Emotional Flooding Scale with the pilot data revealed a one-factor solution with all six emotional flooding items loading above .60. The coefficient alpha for the six items was .90 and they accounted for 65% of the variance. Similarly, a PCA on this scale with the final data revealed a one-factor solution (see Table 5) with all six items loading above .72. These items accounted for 65 % of the variance and I obtained a coefficient alpha of .89.

Social Desirability Scale. For the pilot data, a PCA on the 10-item Social Desirability Scale revealed a one-factor structure with seven items loading .40 or above on the factor. The coefficient alpha for the seven items was .53 and this factor accounted for 20% of the variance. The alpha is low but I believe it reflects the wide range of situations assessed in the measure and is not an indication that the scale is a poor measure of social desirability. For example, one item is “At times I have really insisted on having things my way,” another is “I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone’s feelings” and another is “I’m always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.” Thus, I retained the scale for the final study. A one-factor structure emerged in the analysis of the final data with six items loading .40 or above on the factor (see Table 6). These same six items loaded on the social desirability factor in the pilot study. The coefficient alpha for these six items was .56 and this factor accounted for 20% of the variance.

Table 3

Factor Structure of the Jealousy and Possessiveness Scales for the Final Sample (N = 288)

Item	Factor	
	Jealousy	Possessiveness
<i>Jealousy Scale:</i>		
Overall, how intense were your feelings of jealousy?	.84	
Did you feel that your jealousy was a problem for you during that time?	.82	
How often did you feel jealous?	.78	
Did your jealousy create problems between you and your ex-partner after the breakup?	.74	
How jealousy would your ex say you were during that time?	.73	
Did you think that your jealousy was a problem for your ex during that time?	.68	
<i>Possessiveness Scale</i>		
When we were apart I worried that my partner would find someone new.	.40	
I encouraged my partner to take off and do thing by herself/himself.*		.65
When we were at social events with old friends, I felt OK even if my partner spent most of the time with other people.*		.64
I felt that allowing my partner to maintain old friendships helped our relationship.*		.64
I felt jealous when my partner kept in touch with old friends.		.61
I gained personal satisfaction following interests on my own.*		.58
I encouraged my partner to make new friends.*		.58
I felt that allowing my partner to maintain old friendships hurt our relationship.		.56
I found that making new friends helped our relationship.*		.56
I discouraged my partner from making new friends.		.53
I felt secure about our relationship even though my partner made new friends of the opposite sex.*		.52
I discouraged my partner from developing interests of her/his own.		.50
I felt secure about our relationship even though my partner made new friends of the same sex.*		.50
I got jealous when my partner developed interests on her/his own.		.49
Even though we had a close relationship, I still saw my old friends.*		.44
I spent so much time with my partner that I did not have time to make new friends.		.44
When we were apart I felt unloved and lonely.		
I felt hurt when my partner asked to be alone.		
I found myself wanting to break off the relationship when my partner went away for a week or more.		
I did not like the idea of my partner going to a party if I could not be there too.		
I felt guilty about making new friends of the opposite sex.		
I found it easy to trust my ex-partner when we were apart for a few days.*		
I felt guilty about making new friends of the same sex.		

Note. An asterisk (*) indicates that the item is reverse-scored. To improve interpretability of the table, I did not include complex items or loadings for items that loaded poorly (below .40).

Table 4

Factor Loadings for the Rumination Scale for the Final Sample (N = 288)

Item	Factor Loading
I tended to ruminate or mull over things that happened with my ex-partner for a really long time.	.80
Often, I played back over in my mind how I acted in a situation with my ex-partner.	.75
I often ruminated or mulled over thoughts about the relationship I wanted with my ex-partner.	.74
I often found myself reevaluating something I had done before the relationship ended.	.73
Sometimes, it was hard for me to shut off thoughts about my ex-partner.	.70
I always seemed to rehash in my mind the things I had said to or done with my ex-partner.	.69
After the breakup, my thoughts rarely went back to what happened with my ex-partner.*	.56
My attention was often focused on aspects of the situation with my ex-partner that I wanted to stop thinking about.	.56
It was easy for me to put distressing thoughts about my ex-partner out of my mind.*	.54
I often reflected on episodes involving my ex-partner that I should not have concerned myself with.	.49
After the breakup, I didn't waste time rethinking about things that were over and done with.*	.43
I never thought back over embarrassing or disappointing moments that happened with my ex-partner.*	.42

Note. An asterisk (*) indicates that the item is reverse-scored.

Table 5

Factor Loadings for the Emotional Flooding Scale for the Final Sample (N = 288)

Item	Factor Loading
I felt overwhelmed with bad feelings about the situation with my ex-partner.	.89
I experienced a lot of negative emotion.	.86
I felt frustrated.	.79
I felt bad feelings about the way things ended with my ex-partner.	.79
The fact that I could not have the kind of relationship I wanted with my ex-partner was distressing to me.	.78
As time went by, I got more and more upset about the situation with my ex-partner.	.73

Table 6

Factor Structure of the Social Desirability Scale for Final Sample (N = 288)

Item	Factor Loading
At times I have really insisted on having things my way.*	.63
I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.	.58
I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget.*	.57
I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.	.52
I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.	.51
There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.*	.44
I never resent being asked to return a favor.	
I always try to practice what I preach.	
There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.*	
I like to gossip at times.*	

Note. An asterisk (*) indicates that the item is reverse-scored. To improve interpretability of the table, I did not include loadings for items that loaded poorly (below .40).

Descriptive Statistics

Scale means, standard deviations, and score ranges. The means, standard deviations, obtained ranges, and possible score ranges for all scales are presented in Table 7. Relative to the possible range of scores, participants in the final sample reported moderate levels of social desirability, jealousy, anger, shame, and emotional flooding. They reported experiencing slightly higher than moderate amounts of guilt and rumination. The mean score on possessiveness suggests that participants, in general, reported a low degree of possessiveness.

Intercorrelations among variables. I calculated Pearson Product Moment correlations among all latent variables (i.e., social desirability, mild pursuit, jealousy, possessiveness, anger, shame, guilt, rumination, emotional flooding). All variables in the final study were significantly positively correlated with each other except possessiveness and rumination ($r = .07, ns$) (see Table 8).

Confirmatory Factor Analyses

Prior to conducting the structural analyses, I conducted confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) of the measures to confirm the underlying structures that emerged from the PCAs. When fit was poor, I removed items that loaded poorly on the particular factor until I arrived at the best fit.

A CFA of the seven items assessing jealousy revealed a poor fit to the data, $\chi^2(14) = 160.145$, $p < .001$, $\chi^2/df = 11.439$, CFI = .852, RMSEA = .191. When I deleted the possessiveness item that loaded on the jealousy factor and items 5 and 6 from the jealousy measure (see Appendix C), fit improved substantially, $\chi^2(2) = 2.63, ns$, $\chi^2/df = 1.315$, CFI = .999, RMSEA = .033. Thus, items 1, 2, 3, and 4 (see Appendix C) best represented the jealousy construct. The coefficient alpha for these four items was .87.

For the possessiveness scale, I first conducted a CFA on the 16 items that loaded on the possessiveness factor in the PCA. Fit was poor, $\chi^2(90) = 508.939$, $p < .001$, $\chi^2/df = 5.655$, CFI = .672, RMSEA = .127. The best fitting model included items 2, 3, 8, 14, 20, and 22 (see Appendix D), $\chi^2(9) = 20.427$, $p < .05$, $\chi^2/df = 2.270$, CFI = .974, RMSEA = .067. I obtained a coefficient alpha of .77 for these six items.

Table 7

Means, Standard Deviations, and Score Ranges for Scales Used in Structural Model for the Final Sample (N = 288)

Scale	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Obtained range	Possible range
Social Desirability	6.63	1.15	4-8	4-8
Jealousy	11.12	4.01	4-19	4-20
Possessiveness	9.28	3.34	6-23	6-30
Anger	13.44	4.57	5-25	5-25
Shame	15.64	4.67	5-25	5-25
Guilt	15.17	5.40	7-34	7-35
Rumination	25.49	5.08	7-35	7-35
Emotional Flooding	13.93	3.90	4-20	4-20
Mild Pursuit	16.07	5.68	8-33	8-40

Table 8

Intercorrelations among Latent Constructs for the Final Sample (N = 288)

Construct	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Social Desirability	-	.22**	.17**	.23**	.18**	.18**	.20**	.20**	.14*
2. Mild Pursuit		-	.39**	.44**	.28*	.32**	.33**	.35**	.32**
3. Anger			-	.44**	.23**	.50**	.48**	.42**	.48**
4. Jealousy				-	.28**	.41**	.37**	.42**	.41**
5. Possessiveness					-	.15**	.25**	.07	.12*
6. Shame						-	.63**	.55**	.56**
7. Guilt							-	.35**	.42**
8. Rumination								-	.56**
9. Emotional Flooding									-

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

A CFA of the five anger items indicated a poor fit, $\chi^2(2) = 75.955, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 37.978$, CFI = .893, RMSEA = .359. Removal of the poorest loading items resulted in a worse fit so I retained all five anger items for use in the structural analyses. The coefficient alpha for these items was .88.

I conducted a CFA with shame and guilt items representing separate but correlated constructs. With all items included, fit was fair, $\chi^2(151) = 408.695, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 2.707$, CFI = .899, RMSEA = .077. I found the best model fit when I dropped two shame items (“worried” and “regret”) from the shame factor and removed one guilt item (“feelings of blushing”), $\chi^2(118) = 305.956, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 2.593$, CFI = .919, RMSEA = .074. The coefficient alpha for the five shame items was .85 and for the 12 guilt items it was .90.

A CFA on the rumination items revealed that a two-factor structure provided the best fit to the data, $\chi^2(118) = 72.12, p < .01, \chi^2/df = 1.677$, CFI = .968, RMSEA = .049. The four items that are reverse-scored loaded on one factor and the seven items that are not reverse-scored loaded on another (see Appendix E). The coefficient alpha for the four reverse-scored items was .64 and for the non-reverse scored items it was .84. I used the seven non-reverse scored items to represent rumination in the structural analyses.

I conducted a CFA on the six emotional flooding items. The fit was poor, $\chi^2(9) = 60.38, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 6.709$, CFI = .947, RMSEA = .141. The best fit included items 2, 3, 4 and 6 (see Appendix F), $\chi^2(2) = .735, ns, \chi^2/df = .367$, CFI = 1.00, RMSEA = .00. The coefficient alpha for these four items was .87.

A CFA of the mild pursuit items yielded a poor fit, $\chi^2(35) = 221.531, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 6.329$, CFI = .741, RMSEA = .136. Mild pursuit items 1, 2, 7, 11, 15, 19, 22, and 27 (see Appendix A) represented the best fit, $\chi^2(2) = 6.215, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 6.215$, CFI = .816, RMSEA = .135. The coefficient alpha for these nine items was .79.

A CFA of the six social desirability items that loaded on the social desirability factor indicated that the items represented a good fit to the data, $\chi^2(9) = 10.31, ns, \chi^2/df = 1.146$, CFI = .987, RMSEA = .023. The coefficient alpha for these six items was .58.

Test of the Model

Item Parceling. In structural equation modeling, researchers often use item parcels rather than individual items as indicators of the latent constructs. A parcel is the sum or average of several items assessing a particular construct (Kishton & Widaman, 1994). Using item parcels instead of individual items provides more statistical stability in the model because individual items can have low reliability and low intercorrelations with other variables (Kishton & Widaman, 1994). Two or more parcels are derived from items that make up a scale. I created item parcels as indicators for all of the constructs I measured in the final study except shame and guilt (I describe the reasons for this later in the section on identification of higher-order factors). After creating the item parcels initially, I examined the distribution of scores for each parcel. When parcels were skewed and/or kurtotic, I tried other combinations of the items until I identified parcels that had distributions within or very close to the normal ranges for skewness and kurtosis.

For the social desirability scale, I created three parcels made up of two scale items each. One of the parcels, however, loaded poorly on the social desirability latent factor (.06) so I deleted it. Thus, for the structural model I used items 2, 5, 9, and 10 (see Appendix G) to assess social desirability. The coefficient alpha for these four items was .44.

Identification of higher-order factors. I conducted a PCA on the latent predictors to test for the presence of higher-order factors. I thought that shame and guilt might form one higher-order factor representing self-directed emotions whereas jealousy, possessiveness, and anger could form another representing other-directed emotions. I used participants' scores on the measures of jealousy, possessiveness, anger, shame, and guilt derived from the results of the PCAs and CFAs. Results of the PCA revealed a five-factor structure with each latent factor loading above .90 on their respective factors. Jealousy accounted for 51% of the variance, possessiveness accounted for an additional 18%, anger accounted for another 13%, guilt accounted for 10%, and shame accounted for 7%. Because shame and guilt were highly correlated ($r = .63, p < .01$) and because shame and guilt items loaded on both the Shame and Guilt factors, I combined shame and guilt to represent a higher order factor I labeled Shame/Guilt. When I conducted a PCA and requested four factors, shame and guilt both loaded above .84 on one factor (a Shame/Guilt factor) with jealousy, anger, and possessiveness loading above

.90 on separate factors. Rather than item parcels, I used participants' average scores on the Shame factor and the Guilt factor to create the Shame/Guilt higher-order latent factor.

Model Analyses. I conducted the structural analyses of the final data ($N = 288$) using Amos statistical software (Version 5.0, 2003). The maximum likelihood method of parameter estimation was performed on the covariance matrix. I assessed model fit by reviewing the Goodness of Fit Indices (chi-square to degrees of freedom ratio, root mean square error of approximation [RMSEA; Steiger & Lind, 1980], Bentler's Comparative Fit Index [CFI; Bentler, 1990]), path coefficients, and residual matrices. The chi-square ratio provides a more accurate estimation of model fit than the chi-square alone because it is less dependent on sample size. Burkholder and Harlow (1997) suggest that a chi-square to degrees of freedom ratio less than 2.0 indicates a good fit. Hu and Bentler (1999) recommend that, using a maximum likelihood procedure, a good fit between the hypothesized model and the data is indicated by a CFI value of at least .95 and an RMSEA less than .06. Burkholder and Harlow (1997) also recommend that the model exhibit statistically significant paths that account for a substantial amount of variance in the outcomes. A variable is largely explained by the model if it has a large R^2 value (i.e., .30-.60) (Harlow, 1991).

I treated social desirability as another predictor that is a covariate of the other latent factors. If the other predictors remain significant when including this variable in the structural model, I have controlled for the effects of socially desirable responding. The significance level for all analyses is $p < .05$.

Summary indices indicated that my hypothesized mediational model, illustrated in Figure 1, did not represent a good fit to the data, $\chi^2(130) = 263.96, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 2.030, CFI = .952, RMSEA = .060$ (see Figure 2). Examination of the path coefficients indicated that emotional flooding, a proposed mediator, was not a significant predictor of the dependent variable and only one of the five predictors, jealousy, significantly predicted emotional flooding. Further, rumination, the other proposed mediator, was predicted by jealousy and shame/guilt but not social desirability, possessiveness, or anger. This model explained only 21% of the variance for mild pursuit. Thus, my hypothesized model was not supported.

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Figure 2. Standardized Maximum Likelihood Parameter Estimates for the Hypothesized Mediational Model of Unwanted Pursuit and Stalking

I next took a model generating approach (Hoyle & Panter, 1995) and analyzed different structural models to further investigate the relationships between the latent variables. For example, I examined a model with the predictors and mediators reversed (see Figure 3). Results indicate that the model did not adequately represent the data, $\chi^2(124) = 204.58, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 1.650, CFI = .971, RMSEA = .048$ (see Figure 4). Thirty-six percent of the variance for mild pursuit was explained in this model. Although these fit indices suggest a good-fitting model, examination of the path coefficients revealed that none of the predictors significantly predicted possessiveness and only jealousy predicted pursuit.

I also tested a model with social desirability, anger, shame/guilt, rumination, and emotional flooding as the latent predictors and possessiveness and jealousy as mediators (see Figure 5) but this did not result in a good model fit, $\chi^2(124) = 204.58, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 1.650, CFI = .971, RMSEA = .048$ (see Figure 6). This model explained 36% of the variance for mild pursuit. Again, these indices suggest a good-fitting model but examination of the path coefficients suggested otherwise. Possessiveness was predicted only by anger. Emotional flooding predicted neither the mediators, possessiveness and jealousy, nor the dependent variable, mild pursuit.

By conducting these analyses, I discovered that emotional flooding was serving as neither a latent predictor nor a mediator so I removed it from further analyses. In addition, jealousy emerged as the single mediator. Through this exploratory analysis of various models, I identified a good-fitting model with social desirability, possessiveness, anger, shame/guilt, and rumination as the latent predictors and jealousy as the mediator (see Figure 7). The fit of the model to the data was excellent, $\chi^2(98) = 146.32, p < .01, \chi^2/df = 1.493, CFI = .979, RMSEA = .041$, with 36% of the variance explained for mild pursuit (see Figure 8). For this model, all regression paths were statistically significant except the paths from social desirability to jealousy, social desirability to mild pursuit, anger to mild pursuit, rumination to mild pursuit, shame/guilt to jealousy, and shame/guilt to mild pursuit. I tested this model (the full model) against nested models using structural equation modeling to determine which paths should be retained in the final model.

Testing Nested Models. A nested model is one in which one or more of the paths in the full model has been removed. Testing the full model against nested models serves to determine the

Figure 3. Model with Hypothesized Latent Predictors and Mediators Reversed

Note: $*p < .05$; $**p < .01$; $***p < .001$

Figure 4. Parameter Estimates when Hypothesized Latent Predictors and Mediators are Reversed

Figure 5. Model with Possessiveness and Jealousy as Mediators

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Figure 6. Parameter Estimates for Model with Possessiveness and Jealousy as Mediators

Figure 7. Full Model with Jealousy as the Mediator

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Figure 8. Path Coefficients for Full Model

usefulness of the predictors included in a structural model. To achieve this, I removed paths to and from each predictor individually from the model by setting the paths equal to zero. All other paths were estimated. I then compared the chi-square statistic values for the full and nested models. A significant chi-square difference indicates that deleting the specific path(s) significantly reduces model fit. This suggests that the latent variables excluded in the nested analysis are important to the model and that including those paths in the model would significantly improve overall fit.

I tested the following nested models against the full model:

1. All paths from social desirability removed from the full model.
2. All paths from possessiveness removed from the full model.
3. All paths from anger removed from the full model.
4. All paths from shame/guilt removed from the full model.
5. All paths from rumination removed from the full model.

To assess the usefulness of the latent predictors in predicting the dependent variable, mild pursuit, I tested the following models with direct paths removed:

6. Direct path from social desirability to mild pursuit removed.
7. Direct path from possessiveness to mild pursuit removed.
8. Direct path from anger to mild pursuit removed.
9. Direct path from shame/guilt to mild pursuit removed.
10. Direct path from rumination to mild pursuit removed.

Thus, I evaluated 10 analyses and compared them to the full model based on the chi-square difference statistic. The values for the model, chi-square difference values, fit indices, probability values for the difference based on the difference in degrees of freedom between the full and nested models, and explained variance for mild pursuit are presented in Table 9.

I first conducted nested analyses with individual constructs removed. With social desirability removed from the model, the chi-square difference was not significant, $\chi^2(100) = 150.10$, *ns*, suggesting that social desirability is not an important construct in the model. The chi-square difference when I removed all paths from possessiveness was significant, $\chi^2(100) = 159.64$, $p < .01$, indicating that it is important to include possessiveness in the model. Removing anger from the model also resulted in

Table 9

Summary Statistics of the Nested Model Comparisons

Model	RMSEA	CFI	χ^2 (df)	χ^2 (df) Difference ¹	R ² Mild Pursuit
Full	.041	.979	146.32 (98)	---	.36
<i>Construct Removed</i>					
1. Social desirability	.042	.978	150.10 (100)	3.78 (2)	.35
2. Possessiveness	.046	.947	159.64 (100)	13.32 (2)**	.38
3. Anger	.044	.976	155.85 (100)	9.53 (2)**	.35
4. Shame/Guilt	.041	.979	149.21 (100)	2.89 (2)	.36
5. Rumination	.045	.975	157.12 (100)	10.80 (2)**	.36
<i>Direct Paths Removed</i>					
6. Social desirability to pursuit	.042	.979	148.14 (99)	1.82 (1)	.35
7. Possessiveness to pursuit	.043	.977	151.52 (99)	5.20 (1)*	.35
8. Anger to pursuit	.042	.978	150.11 (99)	3.79 (1)	.35
9. Shame/Guilt to pursuit	.041	.979	146.38 (99)	.06 (1)	.36
10. Rumination to pursuit	.042	.978	149.14 (99)	2.82 (1)	.36

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

¹The critical values for χ^2 at the .05 level of significance are: $\chi^2(1) = 3.84$; $\chi^2(2) = 5.99$. A significant chi-square difference suggests that that construct should be retained in the model based on statistical considerations.

a significant chi-square difference, $\chi^2(100) = 155.85, p < .01$, suggesting that this construct should remain in the model. Analysis of a nested model with shame/guilt removed from the model indicated that this construct is not an important one in the model as indicated by a non-significant chi-square difference, $\chi^2(100) = 149.21, ns$. There was a significant chi-square difference when rumination is removed, $\chi^2(100) = 157.12, p < .01$, suggesting that this is an important construct in the model.

I next conducted nested analyses with direct paths from each latent predictor to mild pursuit removed to determine whether these paths are needed in the model. The only analysis that had a significant chi-square was the analysis with the path from possessiveness to mild pursuit removed, $\chi^2(100) = 151.52, p < .05$. Results from the other analyses did not yield significant chi-square difference values indicating that the direct paths from social desirability, anger, shame/guilt, and rumination to pursuit are not necessary to the model and that their removal would improve model fit, $\chi^2(100) = 148.14, ns$, $\chi^2(100) = 150.11, ns$, $\chi^2(100) = 146.38, ns$, $\chi^2(100) = 149.14, ns$, respectively.

In summary, nested model comparisons revealed that possessiveness, anger, and rumination are statistically important constructs in the model whereas social desirability and shame/guilt are not. Based on the results of these analyses, I removed social desirability and shame/guilt as constructs in the model. I decided to retain the direct paths from anger and rumination to pursuit because their paths are significant and the overall fit of the model is improved when these constructs are included. The final model is presented in Figure 9. The fit of this model is excellent, $\chi^2(55) = 97.10, p < .001$, $\chi^2/df = 1.765$, CFI = .978, RMSEA = .052 (see Figure 10). All path coefficients in this model are statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level and 34% of the variance in mild pursuit is accounted for.

In summary, the following relationships emerged:

- I. Possessiveness was:
 - a. positively associated with jealousy
 - b. positively associated with mild pursuit
2. Anger was:
 - a. positively associated with jealousy
 - b. positively associated with mild pursuit

3. Rumination was:
 - a. positively associated with jealousy
 - b. positively associated with mild pursuit
4. Mild pursuit was:
 - a. positively associated with jealousy

Figure 9. Final Structural Model

Note: $*p < .05$; $**p < .01$; $***p < .001$

Figure 10. Path Coefficients for the Final Model

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

I evaluated a theoretical model of unwanted pursuit and stalking based on Cupach and Spitzberg's (2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002) relational goal pursuit theory. I hypothesized that jealousy, possessiveness, anger, shame, and guilt would contribute to emotional flooding and rumination which would, in turn, predict unwanted pursuit and stalking.

The findings from my final study indicated that jealousy, possessiveness, anger, shame, and guilt did not operate through rumination and emotional flooding to predict unwanted pursuit and stalking, as I had expected. The model that emerged from structural analyses revealed that possessiveness, anger, and rumination predict jealousy which, in turn, predicts mild pursuit. The results also indicated that possessiveness, anger, and rumination contribute directly to mild pursuit. Thus, experiences of possessiveness, anger, rumination, and jealousy are important for understanding mild pursuit. Based on the results from structural analyses, I also concluded that shame/guilt and emotional flooding, as measured in this study, are not important in explaining why a person engages in mild pursuit after the breakup of a relationship.

Some of the variables I included in my investigation had emerged in past research as predictors of unwanted pursuit (i.e., jealousy, anger, possessiveness) (Davis et al., 2000; Del Ben, 2002; Dye & Davis, 2003; Roberts, 2002; Sinclair & Frieze, 2000; Spitzberg, 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1999). The role of rumination and emotional flooding, on the other hand, had not been investigated in previous research on unwanted pursuit and stalking. The results of this study suggest that many of the variables I examined play a significant role in predicting unwanted pursuit. They indicate that jealousy mediates the relationship of possessiveness, anger, and rumination to mild pursuit. Possessiveness, anger, and rumination also directly predict unwanted pursuit. The results provide a profile of a person who is likely to engage in mild pursuit after a relationship breakup. This person was possessive while the relationship is intact, angry after the breakup, and engages in rumination after relationship termination. Further, those who experience possessiveness, anger, and rumination are also more likely to feel jealous after a breakup and this contributes to the likelihood that she or he will pursue a former partner.

Predictor Variables

In my hypothesized model, I expected that jealousy, possessiveness, anger, shame, and guilt would serve as predictors of rumination and emotional flooding which, in turn, would predict unwanted pursuit and stalking. Structural analyses revealed, however, that possessiveness, anger, and rumination predicted both jealousy (the mediator) and mild pursuit (the dependent variable). Shame/guilt and social desirability were not significant predictors in the final model.

Possessiveness. Cupach and Spitzberg (2004) argue that individuals who engage in ORI attempt to escalate closeness with their target through possessiveness characterized by invasions of privacy. Cupach et al. (2000) suggest that jealous individuals are likely to engage in stalking-like behaviors in an effort to protect the relationship from rivals. Using the same measure I used in my study, Cupach and Spitzberg (1999) found that possessiveness was positively associated with perpetration of ORI pursuit and ORI aggression. In addition, Spitzberg (2000) found that individuals with a love style characterized by possessiveness were more likely to engage in more threatening and hyper-intimate pursuit. In the final model identified in my study, possessiveness was predictive of both jealousy and mild pursuit. These results suggest that an individual who has been possessive of her or his partner during their relationship is more likely to pursue that partner after the relationship ends. This possessiveness can also exacerbate feelings of jealousy after the breakup which contributes to the likelihood that the person will pursue her or his ex-partner.

Anger. Individuals who experience the breakup of a relationship that they don't want to end are likely to react with anger (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2004). Participants in the final study reported experiencing a moderate amount of anger, on average, during the time they were having difficulty letting go of someone after the breakup of a relationship. Anger emerged as a predictor of both jealousy and unwanted pursuit.

The results from my study support previous research that examined the role of anger in unwanted pursuit and stalking. In a study of courtship stalking, Sinclair and Frieze (2000) found that an angry reaction to being rejected was positively associated with stalking behavior. Dye and Davis (2003) found that breakup anger-jealousy mediated the relationship of other variables such as breakup initiator status and need for control in predicting stalking-like behaviors. Results from my study

indicated that anger was a predictor, not a mediator, of pursuit. Dye and Davis measured anger and jealousy together in one measure whereas I assessed anger and jealousy in separate scales. The results from my study suggest that anger and jealousy are separate constructs that have distinct contributions to unwanted pursuit.

Rumination. Individuals who ruminate experience unwanted thoughts that are repetitive, intrusive, and distressing (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Martin & Tesser, 1989, 1996; Millar et al., 1988). Such rumination can result from being prevented from attaining an important goal, such as having a desired romantic relationship (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Martin & Tesser, 1989, 1996; Millar et al., 1988. Cupach and Spitzberg (2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002) posit that individuals who link higher-order goals like personal well-being and happiness to having a relationship with a specific person will ruminate on that relationship and be more prone to engage in unwanted pursuit and stalking after the relationship ends. Davis et al. (2000) examined the role of anger-jealousy-obsessiveness in predicting stalking-like behavior. They did not measure anger, jealousy, and obsessiveness separately but the items that assessed obsessiveness (e.g., “Couldn’t get s/he [sic] off my mind” and “Thought about him/her a lot”) were conceptually similar to items included in the rumination scale in my study (e.g., “Sometimes, it was hard for me to shut off thoughts about my ex-partner”). Results from my study suggest that it is important to assess rumination separately from anger and jealousy because it contributes independently to experiences of jealousy and to engaging in unwanted pursuit after relationship termination.

Shame and Guilt. Cupach and Spitzberg (2000) suggested that guilt and shame are sources of rumination. Based on this assertion, I hypothesized that shame and guilt would both predict rumination which, in turn, would predict unwanted pursuit and stalking. In the pilot study, a PCA of the shame and guilt items revealed a single-factor solution indicating that the measure I used did not distinguish between the two constructs. For the final study, I revised the shame and guilt items. A PCA yielded two distinct factors which I labeled Shame and Guilt. Items meant to assess shame, however, loaded on the Guilt factor and vice versa. Therefore, I combined the scales to create a higher-order factor called Shame/Guilt. In the full model, shame/guilt significantly predicted jealousy but nested analyses indicated that this construct was not statistically important to the model so I removed it.

Cupach et al. (2000) suggest that shame and guilt may grow out of feelings of jealousy but in the exploratory model-testing, jealousy did not predict shame/guilt. In my study, shame, guilt, and rumination were significantly and positively correlated. The specific nature of the relationships among shame, guilt, and rumination might be more complex than I could test in my study and should be further investigated with measures that successfully distinguish between participants' experiences of shame and guilt. Retzinger (1995) asserts that overt shame may lead individuals to feel helpless, passive, and out of control whereas covert shame can lead to obsessive thinking, speech, or perception. It might be useful to administer a measure that assesses covert shame as that may better predict jealousy and unwanted pursuit.

Social Desirability. It was important in this study to include a measure of social desirability because I asked participants to report behaviors that they might be reluctant to admit and motivated to underreport (e.g., threatening or harming their ex-partner). I included a measure of social desirability that assessed impression management primarily, the tendency to answer questions in a way that portrays oneself in a more positive light (Paulhus, 1991). Social desirability was not significantly associated with jealousy or unwanted pursuit. This suggests that participants were honest in their responses to the questions asked in the study. The internal consistency of the four items used in the structural analyses, however, was low so results pertaining to the effects of social desirability in this study can only be suggestive. That is, it is possible that participants were not answering the questions honestly but the measure I used did not adequately assess this dishonesty.

Mediating Variables

Relationship partners commonly experience jealousy (Guerrero & Anderson, 1998). Cupach et al. (2000) suggest that a jealous person is likely to engage in stalking-like behaviors (e.g., surveillance) in order to protect the relationship from real or perceived rivals. In my hypothesized model, I expected rumination and emotional flooding to act as mediators of jealousy, possessiveness, anger, shame, and guilt in predicting unwanted pursuit. Exploratory structural analyses revealed, instead, that jealousy mediated the effects of possessiveness, anger, and rumination on mild pursuit. The results of my analyses support Cupach and Spitzberg's (2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002) assertion that jealousy plays an important role in unwanted pursuit. When individuals

lose an important relationship, they often react with jealousy (Guerrero & Anderson, 1998). In my study, jealousy served to mediate the effects of possessiveness, anger, and rumination. The final model indicates that an individual who is possessive during the relationship, angry after the breakup, and who ruminates about the ex-partner and the relationship after its termination is more likely to experience jealousy. The more jealousy the individual experiences, the more likely she or he is to engage in unwanted pursuit.

The results from my study support Cupach et al.'s (2000) suggestion that rumination motivates a jealous person to attempt to reestablish a terminated yet highly desired relationship persistently. The results of my study also reveal that rumination directly contributes to experiences of jealousy which then predicts pursuit. In addition, rumination contributes directly to a person's engaging in unwanted pursuit.

My study supports the research findings that jealousy is an important factor in unwanted pursuit and stalking. Research has found that victims of ORI and stalking perceive their stalkers as jealous (Del Ben, 2002; Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2000; Roberts, 2002). Research with pursuers also points to jealousy as important in predicting unwanted pursuit and stalking (Davis et al., 2000; Dye & Davis, 2003; Sinclair & Frieze, 2000; Spitzberg, 2000).

In their relational goal pursuit theory, Cupach and Spitzberg (2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002) suggest that pursuers become overwhelmed by negative emotion as a result of having an important goal (i.e., to be in a relationship with a specific person) blocked. I expected emotional flooding to mediate the effects of jealousy, possessiveness, anger, shame, and guilt on unwanted pursuit and stalking. As assessed in this study, emotional flooding did not play a role in predicting unwanted pursuit. Bivariate correlations indicated that emotional flooding and rumination were significantly positively correlated, providing some support for Cupach and Spitzberg's assertion that emotional flooding and rumination are mutually reinforcing experiences of pursuers. The results from my study, however, suggest that rumination operates independently of emotional flooding. I eliminated emotional flooding during model-testing because it did not operate as a predictor or mediator of any of the variables in the model. It may be that emotional flooding has a more distal relationship to pursuit that needs to be further investigated.

Contributions of This Study

Theoretical contributions. In this study, I tested aspects of Cupach and Spitzberg's (2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002) relational goal pursuit theory. There had been no research of which I am aware that examined the role of shame, guilt, rumination, and emotional flooding in unwanted pursuit and stalking. Results from my study support Cupach and Spitzberg's assertion that rumination contributes to the likelihood that someone will pursue an ex-partner after relationship termination. They also suggest that emotional flooding, as I measured it, does not contribute to a person's engaging in unwanted pursuit. The final model in my study also provides clarification of how possessiveness, anger, rumination, and jealousy combine to elicit mild pursuit behaviors.

Methodological contributions. One methodological contribution of my research is the use of structural equation modeling to test a hypothesized set of relationships. Structural modeling is a powerful multivariate method that combines factor analysis, multiple regression, and path analysis to explain complex relationships among a large number of variables (Harlow, 1991). Using structural modeling permitted me to test my hypothesized model and when it was not confirmed, I was able to identify a good-fitting model that explains the data well, statistically and theoretically.

Another methodological contribution is the development of measures of jealousy and emotional flooding that appear to assess these constructs adequately. Initially, I tested these measures in the pilot study. The factor structure for each was strong and distinct (i.e., all items loaded highly on one factor) and these structures were replicated for both measures in the final study. I recommend, however, additional testing of these scales to further evaluate their reliability and validity.

The results of my study highlight the importance of distinguishing between anger, jealousy, and possessiveness. Some researchers have treated anger, jealousy, and obsessiveness as a single construct (e.g., Davis et al., 2000; Dye & Davis, 2003). Results from my study indicate that anger, jealousy, and possessiveness are distinct constructs that make independent contributions to predicting unwanted pursuit and should be measured separately.

The results of my study also emphasize the importance of distinguishing between mild and severe behaviors when assessing unwanted pursuit. A PCA of the Unwanted Pursuit Behavior

Inventory (UPBI; Palarea & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1998) revealed two distinct factors reflecting mild and severe pursuit behaviors. Research has found a distinction between mild and severe pursuit behaviors with Spitzberg and Cupach's (1997a, 1997b) measures of ORI for both pursuers and objects of pursuit (Dutton-Greene & Winstead, 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1999; Spitzberg, Nicastro, & Cousins, 1998; Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999) but no research that I am aware of has confirmed this distinction in the UPBI.

Limitations of This Research and Directions for Future Investigation

A limitation to this research derives from my use of cross-sectional data. With cross-sectional data, I cannot make causal conclusions about the relationship of the variables I examined. The results I report can only be suggestive. Longitudinal research would provide stronger evidence for the cause-and-effect relationships of the variables investigated in this study. It would be particularly fruitful to conduct a longitudinal study documenting pursuit behaviors of individuals who are initially in intact relationships and then experience the breakup of a romantic relationship.

I examined a subset of variables that potentially explain unwanted pursuit. In the final model, 34% of the variance in mild pursuit was explained and effect sizes in the model were small to moderate. This highlights the fact that there are more factors that contribute to unwanted pursuit than those assessed in my study. Research is needed to examine other central aspects of Cupach and Spitzberg's (2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002) relational goal pursuit theory that have not yet been tested. For example, researchers should examine the role of linking (i.e., associating a specific relationship with attainment of personal happiness) and rationalization in contributing to a person's engaging in unwanted pursuit and stalking after a breakup.

Cupach and Spitzberg's (2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002) relational goal pursuit theory explains how unwanted pursuit and stalking can develop out of normal processes of relationship development and dissolution. Future research could attempt to combine elements of White et al.'s (2000) integrative contextual developmental model of stalking with Cupach and Spitzberg's (2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002) theory. In addition to the role of rumination, emotional flooding, and linking specified by Cupach and Spitzberg (2004; Cupach et al., 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2002), researchers could examine the ability of sociocultural (e.g., gender roles),

interpersonal (e.g., experiences with family and peers), dyadic (e.g., communication strategies), and situational (e.g., use of drugs and alcohol) factors in predicting unwanted pursuit and stalking (White et al., 2000). Merging the two theories could provide a more comprehensive explanation of why some people engage in unwanted pursuit and stalking after the breakup of a romantic relationship.

Because so few participants reported severe pursuit behaviors and those who did so reported few of them, I could not use severe pursuit as a dependent variable in either the pilot or final studies. Therefore, I could not assess the model as it applies to more severe pursuit behaviors that fall into the realm of stalking behavior. I could only evaluate the ability of the model to predict the milder behaviors that targets consider benign, annoying, or bothersome rather than threatening or dangerous (Cupach & Spitzberg, 1998). Future research should test this model with a sample of individuals who report more stalking-like behaviors. Research efforts could focus on clinical or forensic samples where rates of stalking behaviors are higher than are typically found in college student samples. Alternately, researchers could make an effort to design their questionnaires such that pursuers are more likely to report severe pursuit behaviors. For example, Davis et al. (2000) asked college students about their stalking-like behaviors in the context of relationship breakups. Before asking questions about stalking-like behaviors, they gave participants the opportunity to report on their emotional reactions to the breakup and their attempts to reestablish the relationship and convey their love for the ex-partner. This approach elicited fairly high levels of self-reported stalking-like behaviors following the breakups. It should be noted that victims of even minor levels of pursuit can perceive the behavior as threatening (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2000) so investigation into the predictors of mild pursuit remains an important area of research.

I arrived at the final model through a model generating approach (Hoyle & Panter, 1995). Hoyle and Panter (1995) state that this approach can be problematic because it can capitalize on the idiosyncracies of a particular sample. With small samples, the likelihood of replicating the model becomes quite low (Hoyle & Panter, 1995). Because of this, it is important to evaluate the replicability of the model with a different set of data. The variables that contributed to unwanted pursuit in this study may not be significant variables in a replication study. When developing the final model, I chose to retain the direct effects from anger and rumination to mild pursuit despite results of a nested model

comparison suggesting this effect was statistically unimportant. It would be particularly important to evaluate whether anger and rumination are directly associated with unwanted pursuit in a separate sample.

There are limitations to the generalizability of results of this research. I used convenience samples in both the pilot and final studies. Because I did not collect data from a random sample, I am not able to generalize the results to all individuals who have had difficulty letting go of someone after the breakup of an intimate relationship. In addition, participants in both studies were predominantly young, White, and heterosexual. I am therefore not able to generalize the results to other populations (e.g., older people, young people not in college, lesbians). It is important that future researchers attempt to replicate the model with samples that are more diverse in terms of age, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, and socio-economic status.

Also, those who volunteered to participate in this study may have been different in significant ways from those who did not. For example, those who did not participate may be individuals reluctant to report more extreme and perhaps illegal pursuit behaviors (e.g., kidnapping or physically injuring their ex-partner).

I did not examine sex differences in the model. It is possible that women and men differ in how jealousy, possessiveness, anger, shame, guilt, emotional flooding, and rumination combine to elicit unwanted pursuit. Thus, it is important that future research test whether the women and men arrive at unwanted pursuit through the same emotional mechanisms.

Implications

The results of my study contribute to a better understanding of what motivates an individual to engage in unwanted pursuit after the breakup of a romantic relationship. The final model in this study provides a profile of someone who is likely to engage in pursuit after the breakup of a relationship. This is a person who was possessive while the relationship was intact, ruminated about the ex-partner and the relationship, and felt angry after the relationship ended. Possessiveness, anger, and rumination can also exacerbate feelings of jealousy which make unwanted pursuit even more likely.

This profile can help guide the development of interventions for both pursuers and objects of pursuit. Counselors and educators can use the results of my research to inform prevention and

intervention efforts. They can educate potential victims of the warning signs that an ex-partner might engage in unwanted pursuit after a relationship breakup. Potential victims can be alert to their partner's possessiveness during the relationship and angry, jealous, and ruminative responses after the breakup. Recognizing the signs early on will permit victims to seek help before the pursuit behaviors escalate. Such preventive education can also help potential pursuers recognize those traits in themselves and perhaps lead them to seek help in coping with the dissolution of an important relationship and avoid engaging in unwanted pursuit.

Because there has been a lack of well-developed theory to explain unwanted pursuit and stalking (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2004), it remains essential that researchers continue to test and refine the few theories that do exist. Empirically supported theories are essential in guiding effective prevention and intervention efforts.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Unwanted Pursuit Behavior Inventory

Instructions: The following questionnaire asks about the ways you may have contacted or attempted to contact your ex-partner after the breakup. In response to losing an important relationship, you may have said or done things that you might not have ordinarily said or done, things that were not characteristic of you. Please answer the questions honestly and remember that this survey is anonymous.

When answering the following questions, refer to the period of time in which you were having difficulty letting go of your former relationship partner. Did you engage in any of the following behaviors after the breakup? Click on the circle that corresponds to the number of times you engaged in each behavior.

Report only on your behaviors you think or know your ex-partner *DID NOT WELCOME*. Click on the circle that corresponds to the number of times you engaged in each behavior that your ex-partner *DID NOT WELCOME*.

Unwanted Contact Behavior	Frequency of Contact				
	Never (1)	Once (2)	2-3 times (3)	4-5 times (4)	Over 5 times (5)
Did you ever:					
1. Send/leave your ex-partner letters, emails, faxes, pages, gifts, cards, etc. (M)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Ask friends for information about your ex-partner (M)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Threaten your ex-partner with a weapon (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Talk with your ex-partner in an internet chat room (M)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Force your ex-partner to engage in sexual contact after the breakup (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Unexpectedly visit your ex-partner at her/his home (M)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Leave your ex-partner phone messages or hang-up calls (M)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Threaten to harm your ex-partner (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Show up in places where you thought your ex-partner might be (M)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. Make vague or implied threats to your ex-partner (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Give your ex-partner items (e.g., letters, gifts) in person (M)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. Cause damage to your ex-partner's property (e.g., home, car, etc.) (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. Wait outside of your ex-partner's home/work/school (M)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. Cause harm to someone close to your ex-partner or to her/his pet (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Did you ever:	Never (1)	Once (2)	2-3 times (3)	4-5 times (4)	Over 5 times (5)
15. Go out of your way to run into your ex-partner "unexpectedly" (M)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. Threaten to release information that would be harmful to your ex-partner (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. Contact your ex-partner's family/friends without her/his permission (M)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. Threaten to kill someone close to your ex-partner or her/his pet (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. Engage your ex-partner in a phone conversation (M)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. Release information that was harmful to your ex-partner (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. Steal items from your ex-partner (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22. Unexpectedly visit your ex-partner at school/work/some other public place (M)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
23. Threaten to harm someone close to your ex-partner or her/his pet (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
24. Follow your ex-partner (M)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
25. Physically injure your ex-partner (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
26. Kidnap your ex-partner or hold your ex-partner against her/his will (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
27. Engage your ex-partner in a conversation in person (M)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
28. Threaten to kill your ex-partner (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Note. An M indicates a mild pursuit item and an S indicates a severe pursuit item.

Appendix B

Shame/Guilt/Anger Scale (Pilot Study)

Instructions. For each of the following listed feelings, please click on the response that best reflects how common the feeling was for you during time you were having difficulty letting go of a former relationship partner. Your responses should not reflect how you think you should have felt or wish you had felt. Rather, please indicate how you actually felt at the time. Click on the circle that corresponds to your answer.

How often did you feel:	Never (1)	Rarely (2)	Some of the time (3)	Frequently but not continuously (4)	Continuously or almost continuously (5)
1. Embarrassment (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Mild guilt (G)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Ridiculous (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Anger (A)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Worried about hurting or injuring my ex-partner (G)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Sadness	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Self-consciousness (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Humiliated (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Intense guilt (G)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. Mad (A)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Euphoria	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. Stupid (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. Annoyed (A)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. Regret (G)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. Childish (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. Mild happiness	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. Helpless, paralyzed (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. Depression	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. Hostile (A)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. Feelings of blushing (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. You deserved criticism for what you did (G)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22. Laughable (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
23. Rage (A)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
24. Enjoyment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
25. Disgusting to others (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
26. Remorse (G)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
27. Furious (A)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
28. Worried about hurting or injuring someone who was in the way of my relationship with my ex-partner (G)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Note. An S indicates an item that assesses shame, a G indicates a guilt item, and an A indicates an anger item.

Appendix C

Jealousy Scale

Instructions: When answering the following questions, refer to the period of time in which you were having difficulty letting go of a former relationship partner. Click on the circle next to the number that corresponds to your answer.

1. How often did you feel jealous?

Not at all often

☐ 1

☐ 2

Sometimes

☐ 3

☐ 4

Very often

☐ 5

2. How jealous would your ex-partner say you were during that time?

Not at all jealous

☐ 1

☐ 2

Moderately
jealous

☐ 3

☐ 4

Very jealous

☐ 5

3. Overall, how intense were your feelings of jealousy?

Not at all intense

☐ 1

☐ 2

Moderately
intense

☐ 3

☐ 4

Very intense

☐ 5

4. Did you feel that your jealousy was a problem *for you* during that time?

Not at all a
problem

☐ 1

☐ 2

Somewhat a
problem

☐ 3

☐ 4

Very much a
problem

☐ 5

5. Did you think that your jealousy was a problem *for your ex-partner* during that time?

Not at all

☐ 1

☐ 2

Somewhat

☐ 3

☐ 4

A lot

☐ 5

6. Did your jealousy create problems between you and your ex-partner after the breakup?

Not at all

☐ 1

☐ 2

Somewhat

☐ 3

☐ 4

A lot

☐ 5

Appendix D

Possessiveness Scale

Instructions: When you answer the questions below, think about the relationship you had with your ex-partner while you were still together. Your answers should reflect how you generally felt, thought, or acted in those situations as they applied to that person. If a certain situation never occurred, answer as you think you would have responded in that situation.

For each of the following statements, click on the circle that corresponds to your answer.

	Never (1)	Seldom (2)	Sometimes (3)	Often (4)	Almost always or always (5)
1. Even though we had a close relationship, I still saw my old friends.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. I discouraged my partner from developing interests of her/his own.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. I felt jealous when my partner kept in touch with old friends.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. I encouraged my partner to take off and do thing by herself/himself.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. I encouraged my partner to make new friends.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. I felt secure about our relationship even though my partner made new friends of the same sex.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. When we were at social events with old friends, I felt OK even if my partner spent most of the time with other people.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. I felt that allowing my partner to maintain old friendships hurt our relationship.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. When we were apart I felt unloved and lonely.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. I felt secure about our relationship even though my partner made new friends of the opposite sex.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. I felt hurt when my partner asked to be alone.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. I felt that allowing my partner to maintain old friendships helped our relationship.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. When we were apart I worried that my partner would find someone new.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. I discouraged my partner from making new friends.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Almost always or always
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
15. I found myself wanting to break off the relationship when my partner went away for a week or more.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. I discouraged my partner from making new friends.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. I found myself wanting to break off the relationship when my partner went away for a week or more.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. I did not like the idea of my partner going to a party if I could not be there too.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. I felt guilty about making new friends of the opposite sex.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. I found it easy to trust my ex-partner when we were apart for a few days.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. I found that making new friends helped our relationship.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. I got jealous when my partner developed interests on her/his own.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. I gained personal satisfaction following interests on my own.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22. I spent so much time with my partner that I did not have time to make new friends.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
23. I felt guilty about making new friends of the same sex.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Note. An asterisk (*) indicates that the item is reverse-scored.

Appendix E

Pursuit-Specific Rumination Scale

Instructions: When answering the following questions, refer to the period of time in which you had difficulty letting go of a former relationship partner. Click on the circle that reflects how much you agree with each statement.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
1. I always seemed to rehash in my mind the things I had said to or done with my ex-partner.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. I never thought back over embarrassing or disappointing moments that happened with my ex-partner.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Sometimes, it was hard for me to shut off thoughts about my ex-partner.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. I tended to ruminate or mull over things that happened with my ex-partner for a really long time.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. It was easy for me to put distressing thoughts about my ex-partner out of my mind.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. I often ruminated or mulled over thoughts about the relationship I wanted with my ex-partner.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. My attention was often focused on aspects of the situation with my ex-partner that I wanted to stop thinking about.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. After the breakup, I didn't waste time rethinking about things that were over and done with.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Often, I played back over in my mind how I acted in a situation with my ex-partner.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. I often reflected on episodes involving my ex-partner that I should not have concerned myself with.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. After the breakup, my thoughts rarely went back to what happened with my ex-partner.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. I often found myself reevaluating something I had done before the relationship ended.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Note. An asterisk (*) indicates that the item is reverse-scored.

Appendix F

Emotional Flooding Scale

Instructions: For each of the statements that follow, please click on the response that reflects how much the statement describes your emotional experience during the breakup. Click on the circle that corresponds to your answer.

	Not at all	A little	Somewhat	A lot	Completely
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. As time went by, I got more and more upset about the situation with my ex-partner.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. I felt bad feelings about the way things ended with my ex-partner.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. I experienced a lot of negative emotion.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. I felt overwhelmed with bad feelings about the situation with my ex-partner.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. The fact that I could not have the kind of relationship I wanted with my ex-partner was distressing to me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. I felt frustrated.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Appendix G

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Short Form X1)

Instructions: Listed below are a number of statements concerning different attitudes and behaviors. For each item, choose the answer you think best describes you.

Click next to the letter T if the statement is TRUE for you. Click next to the letter F if it is FALSE.

True	False	Item
☐	☐	1. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.
☐	☐	2. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.*
☐	☐	3. I never resent being asked to return a favor.
☐	☐	4. I always try to practice what I preach.
☐	☐	5. I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget.*
☐	☐	6. At times I have really insisted on having things my way.*
☐	☐	7. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.*
☐	☐	8. I like to gossip at times.*
☐	☐	9. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
☐	☐	10. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.

*Items marked with an asterisk are reverse-scored.

Appendix H

Recruiting Announcement (Pilot Study)

Have you ever found it difficult to let go of someone after the breakup of a romantic relationship?

Sometimes, when a romantic relationship ends, one or the other person may have a hard time letting go. The breakup may not have been permanent. You might have thought it was permanent at the time but eventually gotten back together. If you have ever had difficulty letting go of a relationship partner either of the same or the opposite sex, I invite you to complete an anonymous online questionnaire so more can be learned about how and why people react the way they do to the loss of an important relationship. It takes 20-25 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

To complete the questionnaire online, click on the following website: www.uri.edu/personal/ldut8448. Once you are done completing the questionnaire on the website, you will click on a button that will send your responses to an email account. There is no way anyone will be able to identify you.

This research is being conducted by Leila B. Dutton-Greene, MS, a doctoral student in the Department of Psychology at the University of Rhode Island under the supervision of Lisa Bowleg, Ph.D.

Appendix I

Recruiting Announcement (Final Study)

Project description: The purpose of this study is to investigate how people react to the breakup of a relationship they don't want to end. You will complete an anonymous online questionnaire asking about various ways you or a partner may have responded to the breakup of a romantic relationship.

Time commitment: It will take approximately 30 minutes to complete this questionnaire.

Requirements for participation:

1. You must be at least 18 years of age.
2. At some time in your life, you experienced the breakup of a romantic relationship.

To access the online questionnaire, click on the following link: www.lbd-g.com

Appendix J

Introduction to the Study

The breakup of a romantic relationship can be a difficult experience, especially when one partner does not want the relationship to end. I am interested in learning about how people react when a relationship has ended that they did not want to end. If you have NEVER had such an experience, click [here](#).

If you have had a hard time letting go of a relationship partner more than once, think about the most recent relationship breakup where you did not want to lose your partner. The breakup may not have been permanent. You might have thought it was permanent at the time but you eventually got back together.

It is important that you CAREFULLY read the instructions for each set of questions because for some questions you will be asked to report about your feelings and behaviors *during* the relationship whereas for others you will report about your feelings and behaviors *after* the relationship ended.

Remember, *there are no right or wrong answers*. Your responses will be *anonymous* because you will complete the questionnaire on a website. When you are done filling out the questionnaire, your responses will be sent anonymously to an email account. There is no way anyone will be able to identify you.

Click [here](#) to indicate you have read the instructions above.

Click [here](#) if you do not wish to continue.

Appendix K

Demographics Questionnaire

Instructions: In this last section, I ask that you provide some information about yourself. This information will help me learn more about who participated in this study and how this background information may relate to other questions you answered. Your answers will remain anonymous, as will your answers to all other questions.

1. What is your age?
2. What is your sex? ☐ 1. Female
☐ 2. Male
3. What is the sex of the ex-partner you referred to when responding to this questionnaire?
☐ 1. Female
☐ 2. Male
4. What is your race (check all that apply)?
☐ 1. African-American/Black
☐ 2. Caucasian (non-Hispanic/Latino)/White
☐ 3. Asian-American/Pacific Islander
☐ 4. Native American
☐ 5. Bi/Multiracial (Specify: _____)
☐ 6. Other (Specify: _____)
5. What is your sexual identity (check one)?
☐ 1. Heterosexual
☐ 2. Lesbian
☐ 3. Gay man
☐ 4. Bisexual
☐ 5. Questioning
☐ 6. Other (Specify: _____)

Appendix L

Shame/Guilt/Anger Scale (Final Study)

Instructions. For each of the following listed feelings, please click on the response that best reflects how common the feeling was for you during time you were having difficulty letting go of a former relationship partner. Your responses should not reflect how you think you should have felt or wish you had felt. Rather, please indicate how you actually felt at the time. Click on the circle that corresponds to your answer.

How often did you feel:	Never (1)	Rarely (2)	Some of the time (3)	Frequently but not continuously (4)	Continuously or almost continuously (5)
1. Embarrassed (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Angry (A)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Worried (G)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Sad	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. People looked down on you (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Stupid (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Like you had no morals (G)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Full of self-doubt (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Mad (A)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. Relieved	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Regret (G)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. Down on yourself (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. Childish (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. Hostile (A)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. Depressed (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. Remorseful (G)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. You were not quite good enough (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. Afraid that your faults would be revealed to others (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. Guilty (G)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. You were a bad person (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. Full of rage (A)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22. Feelings of blushing (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
23. Happy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
24. You had said or done something inappropriate (G)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
25. Ashamed (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
26. You deserved criticism (G)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
27. Foolish (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
28. Furious (A)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
29. You handled things poorly (G)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Note. An S indicates an item that assesses shame, a G indicates a guilt item, and an A indicates an anger item.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Addis, M. E., & Mahalik, J. R. (2003). Men, masculinity, and the contexts of help seeking. *American Psychologist*, 58, 5-14.
- Bartholomew, K. (1993). From childhood to adult relationships: Attachment theory and research. In S. Duck (Ed.), *Learning about relationships* (pp. 30-62). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Batza, D. M., & Taylor, M. (1999). Stalking in the community and workplace. In E. K. Call (Ed.), *Violence in our lives: Impact on workplace, home, and community*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indices in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 238-246.
- Bentler, P. M. (1995). *EQS structural equations program manual*. Encino, CA: Multivariate Software.
- Bernhard, L. A. (2000). Physical and sexual violence experienced by lesbian and heterosexual women. *Violence Against Women*, 6, 68-79.
- Bjerregaard, B. (2000). An empirical study of stalking victimization. *Violence and Victims*, 15, 389-406.
- Bratslavsky, E., Baumeister, R. F., & Sommer, K. L. (1998). To love or be loved in vain: The trials and tribulations of unrequited love. In B. H. Spitzberg & W. R. Cupach (Eds.), *The dark side of close relationships* (pp. 307-326). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult attachment: An integrative overview. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 46-76). New York: Guilford Press.
- Bryson, J. B. (1991). Modes of response to jealousy-evoking situations. In P. Salovey (Ed.), *The psychology of jealousy and envy* (pp. 178-207). New York: Guilford.
- Buelow, G., McClain, M., & McIntosh, I. (1996). A new measure for an important construct: The Attachment and Object Relations Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 66, 604-623.
- Burgess, A. W., Baker, T., Greening, D., Hartman, C. R., Burgess, A. G., Douglas, J. E., & Halloran, R. (1997). Stalking behaviors within domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 12, 389-403.

- Burkholder, G. J., & Harlow, L. L. (1997). Using structural equation modeling techniques to evaluate HIV risk models. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 3, 348-368.
- Buss, D. M. (1988). From vigilance to violence: Tactics of mate retention in American undergraduates. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 9, 291-317.
- Carson, C. L., & Cupach, W. R. (2000). Fueling the flames of the green-eyed monster: The role of ruminative thought in reaction to romantic jealousy. *Western Journal of Communication*, 64, 308-329.
- Chrisler, J. C., Golden, C., & Rozee, P. D. (1996). *Lectures on the psychology of women*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Coleman, F. L. (1997). Stalking behavior and the cycle of domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12, 420-433.
- Cook, D. R. (1988). Measuring shame: The Internalized Shame Scale. *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly*, 4, 197-215.
- Crowell, N. A., & Burgess, A. W. (1996). *Understanding violence against women*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24, 349-354.
- Cruz, M. J., & Firestone, J. M. (1998). Exploring violence and abuse in gay male relationships. *Violence and Victims*, 13, 159-173.
- Cupach, W. R., & Spitzberg, B. H. (1998). Obsessive relational intrusion and stalking. In B. H. Spitzberg & W. R. Cupach (Eds.), *The dark side of close relationships* (pp. 233-263). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cupach, W. R., & Spitzberg, B. H. (2000). Obsessive relational intrusion. *Violence and Victims*, 15, 357-372.
- Cupach, W. R., & Spitzberg, B. H. (2004). *The dark side of relational pursuit: From attraction to obsession to stalking*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Cupach, W. R., Spitzberg, B. H., & Carson, C. L. (2000). Toward a theory of obsessive relational intrusion. In K. Dindia & S. Duck (Eds.), *Communication and personal relationships*. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Davis, K. E., Ace, A., & Andra, M. (2000). Stalking perpetrators and psychological maltreatment of partners: Anger-jealousy, attachment insecurity, need for control, and breakup context. *Violence and Victims, 15*, pp. 407-425.
- Davis, K. E., Coker, A. L., & Sanderson, M. (2002). Physical and mental health effects of being stalked for men and women. *Violence and Victims, 17*, 429-443.
- Del Ben, K. (2002). Stalking: Developing an empirical typology to classify stalkers. *Journal of Forensic Sciences, 47*, 152-158.
- Department of Justice. (1998). *Stalking and domestic violence* (Third Annual Report to Congress under the Violence Against Women Act, NCJ 172204). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Dutton-Greene, L. B., & Winstead, B. A. (2000). *Factors associated with the occurrence of obsessive relational intrusion*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Dye, M. L., & Davis, K. E. (2003). Stalking and psychological abuse: Common factors and relationship-specific characteristics. *Violence and Victims, 18*, 163-180.
- Emerson, R. M., Ferris, K. O., & Gardner, C. B. (1998). On being stalked. *Social Problems, 45*, 289-314.
- Fisher, B. F., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). *The sexual victimization of college women* (NIJ No. 182369). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Fischer, D. G., & Fick, C. (1993). Measuring social desirability: Short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 53*, 417-424.
- Gottman, J. M. (1994). *What predicts divorce?* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Guadagnoli, E., & Velicer, W. F. (1988). Relation of sample size to the stability of component patterns. *Psychological Bulletin, 103*, 265-275.

- Guerrero, L. K., & Anderson, P. A. (1998). The dark side of jealousy and envy: Desire, delusion, desperation, and destructive communication. In B. H. Spitzberg & W. R. Cupach (Eds.), *The dark side of close relationships* (pp. 33-70), Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hall, D. M. (1998). The victims of stalking. In J. R. Meloy (Ed.), *The psychology of stalking: Clinical and forensic perspectives* (pp. 113-137). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Harder, D. W., & Zalma, A. (1990). Two promising shame and guilt scales: A construct validity comparison. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 55, 729-745.
- Harlow, L. L. (1991). *Structural equation modeling: A conceptual approach*. Unpublished workshop monograph. University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI.
- Hoyle, R. H., & Panter, A. T. (1995). Writing about structural equation models. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.) *Structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues, and applications* (pp. 158-176). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1-55.
- Island, D., & Letellier, P. (1991). *Men who beat the men who love them: Battered gay men and domestic violence*. New York: Haworth Press.
- Kienlen, K. K. (1998). Developmental and social antecedents of stalking. In J. R. Meloy (Ed.) *The Psychology of Stalking: Clinical and Forensic Perspectives* (pp. 51-67). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Kishton, J. M., & Widaman, K. F. (1994). Unidimensional versus domain representative parceling of questionnaire items: An empirical example. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 54, 757-765.
- Kurt, J. L. (1995). Stalking as a variant of domestic violence. *Bulletin of the Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 23, 219-230.
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., & Rohling, M. (2000). Negative family-of-origin experiences: Are they associated with perpetrating unwanted pursuit behaviors? *Violence and Victims*, 15, 459-471.

- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Palarea, R. W., Cohen, J. & Rohling, M. (2000). Breaking up is hard to do: Unwanted pursuit behaviors following the dissolution of a romantic relationship. *Violence and Victims, 15*, 73-90.
- Lee, J. A. (1976). *The colors of love*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Letellier, P. (1994). Gay and bisexual male domestic violence victimization: Challenges to feminist theory and responses to violence. *Violence and Victims, 9*, 95-106.
- Lewis, H. B. (1971). *Shame and guilt in neurosis*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Lewis, H. B. (1976). *Psychic war in men and women*. New York: New York University Press.
- Lie, G. Y., Schilit, R., Bush, J., Montagne, M., & Reyes, L. (1991). Lesbians in currently aggressive relationship: How frequently do they report aggressive past relationships? *Violence and Victims, 6*, 121-135.
- Lockhart, L. L., White, B. W., Causby, V., & Isaac, A. (1994). Letting out the secret: Violence in lesbian relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 9*, 469-492.
- Logan, T.K., Leukefeld, & Walker, B. (2000). Stalking as a variant of intimate violence: Implications from a young adult sample. *Violence and Victims, 15*, 91-111.
- Martin, L. L., & Tesser, A. (1989). Toward a motivational and structural theory of ruminative thought. In J. S. Uleman & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *Unintended thought* (pp. 306-326). New York: Guilford.
- Martin, L. L., & Tesser, A. (1996). Some ruminative thoughts. In R. S. Wyer (Ed.), *Ruminative thoughts* (pp. 1-47). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- McIntosh, W. D., Harlow, T. F., & Martin, L. L. (1995). Linkers and nonlinkers: Goal beliefs as a moderator of the effects of everyday hassles on rumination, depression, and physical complaints. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 25*, pp. 1231-1244.
- McIntosh, W. D., & Martin, L. L. (1992). The cybernetics of happiness: The relation of goal attainment, rumination, and affect. In M. S. Clark (Ed.) *Emotion and social behavior* (pp. 222-246). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meloy, J. R. (1996). Stalking (obsessional following): A review of some preliminary studies. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 1*, 147-162.

- Meloy, J. R., & Boyd, C. (2003). Female stalkers and their victims. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 31, 211-219.
- Millar, K. U., Tesser, A., & Millar, M. (1988). The effects of a threatening life event on behavior sequences and intrusive thoughts: A self-disruption explanation. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 12, 441-457.
- Mullen, P. & Pathé, M. (1994). Stalking and the pathologies of love. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 28, 469-477.
- Mullen, P., Pathé, M., & Purcell, R. (2000a). Same-gender stalking. *Journal of American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 28, 191-197.
- Palarea, R. E., & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (1998). *Unwanted Pursuit Behavior Inventory*. Unpublished measure.
- Palarea, R. E., Zona, M. A., Lane, J. C., & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (1999). The dangerous nature of intimate relationship stalking: Threats, violence, and associated risk factors. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 17, 269-283.
- Pathé, M. T., Mullen, P. E., & Purcell, R. (2000). Same-gender stalking. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 28, pp. 191-197.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1984). Two-component models of socially desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 598-609.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1986). Self-deception and impression management in test responses. In A. Angleitner & J. S. Wiggins (Eds.), *Personality assessment via questionnaire* (pp. 143-165). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1991). Measurement and control of response bias. In J. P. Robinson (Ed.), *Measures of personality and social attitudes* (pp. 17-59). San Diego, CA: Academic.
- Peele, S., & Brodsky, A. (1976). *Love and addiction*. New York: Taplinger.
- Perez, C. (1993). Stalking: When does obsession become a crime? *American Journal of Criminal Law*, 20, 263-280.
- Pinto, R. P., & Hollandsworth, J. G. (1984). A measure of possessiveness in intimate relationships. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 2, 273-279.

- Purcell, R., Pathé, M., & Mullen, P. E. (2001). A study of women who stalk. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 158, 2056-2060.
- Ramanaiah, N. & Martin, H. J. (1980). On the two-dimensional nature of the Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 44, 507-514.
- Renzetti, C. (1992). *Violent betrayal: Partner abuse in lesbian relationships*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Retzinger, S. M. (1995). Shame and anger in personal relationships. In S. W. Duck & J. T. Wood (Eds.) *Relationship challenges: (Understanding relationship processes 5)* (pp. 22-42). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Reynolds, W. M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 38, 119-125.
- Roberts, K. A. (2002). Stalking following the breakup of romantic relationships: Characteristics of stalking former partners. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 47, 1070-1077.
- Sinclair, H. C., & Frieze, I. H. (2000). Initial courtship behavior and stalking: How should we draw the line? *Violence and Victims*, 15, 23-40.
- Spitzberg, B. H. (2000, November). Forlorn love: Attachment styles, love styles, loneliness, and obsessional thinking as predictors of obsessive relational intrusion. Paper presented at the National Communication Association Conference, Seattle, WA.
- Spitzberg, B. H. (2002). *The tactical topography of stalking victimization and management*. *Trauma Violence, and Abuse*, 3, 261-288.
- Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (2002). The inappropriateness of relational intrusion. In R. Goodwin & D. Cramer (Eds). *'Inappropriate' relationships: The unconventional, the disapproved, and the forbidden* (pp. 191-219). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (1999, May). *Jealousy, suspicion, possessiveness and obsession as predictors of obsessive relational intrusion*. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, San Francisco, CA.
- Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (1997a). *Obsessive pursuit – Victim short form*. Unpublished measure.

- Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (1997b). *Relational pursuit – Pursuer short form*. Unpublished measure.
- Spitzberg, B. H., Nicastro, A., & Cousins, A. (1998). Exploring the interactional phenomenon of stalking and obsessive relational intrusion. *Communication Reports*, 11, 33-47.
- Stevens, J. P. (2002). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (4th Ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Steiger, J. H., & Lind, C. (1980, May). *Statistically based tests for the number of common factors*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Psychometric Society, Iowa City, IA.
- Strahan, R., & Gerbasi, K. C. (1972). Short, homogeneous versions of the Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 28, 191-193.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics* (3rd ed.). New York: HarperCollins.
- Tangney, J. P. (1995). Recent advances in the empirical study of shame and guilt. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 38, 1132-1145.
- Tennov, D. (1979). *Love and limerance*. New York: Stein and Day.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1998). *Stalking in America: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*. Denver, CO: Center for Policy Research.
- Tjaden, P., Thoennes, N., & Allison, C. J. (2000). Comparing stalking victimization from legal and victim perspectives. *Violence and Victims*, 15, 7-22.
- Trapnell, P. D., & Campbell, J. D. (1999). Private self-consciousness and the five-factor model of personality: Distinguishing rumination from reflection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 284-304.
- Turell, S. (2000). A descriptive analysis of same-sex relationship violence for a diverse sample. *Journal of Family Violence*, 15, 281-293.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (1998). *Vital and health statistics: Current estimates from the national Health Interview Survey, 1995* (DHHS Publication No. PHW 98-1527). Hyattsville, MD: Author.

- Walker, L. E., & Meloy, J. R. (1998). Stalking and domestic violence. In J. R. Meloy (Ed.) *The psychology of stalking: Clinical and forensic perspectives* (pp. 139-161). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- White, G. L., & Mullen, P. E. (1989). *Jealousy: Theory, research, and clinical strategies*. New York: Guilford Press.
- White, J., Kowalski, R. M., Lyndon, A., & Valentine, S. (2000). An integrative contextual developmental model of male stalking. *Violence and Victims, 15*, 373-388.