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Abstract

Stalking, harassing and obsessive relational intrusion (ORI) has received growing attention in academic literature in recent years. Work has also focused on various coping tactics victims use to deal with unwanted pursuit. Few studies, however, have focused on non-Anglo populations and how they cope. Stalking is a persistent pattern of intrusive, harassing, or pursuing behaviors that are unwanted. Relational intrusion may be fear-inducing and it can pose a threat to one’s safety. Coping tactics available to victims of stalking and ORI include moving inward (via self-empowerment or self-actualization), moving outward (seeking help from others), moving away from the pursuer (avoidance), moving with / toward the pursuer (renegotiate) and/or moving against (retaliation). News reports in Japan have shown an increase in the number of stalking cases reported in recent years, but little academic work has analyzed the problem, including what tactics the Japanese use to cope with the unwanted pursuit. This study aims to fill that gap through a sample Japanese population. We asked the following question: What is the prevalence of stalking and obsessive relational intrusion in Japan, and what measures are used on the part of the victims to cope with the unwanted intrusion? In this sample Japanese population, 54 subjects (26.9%) reported some unwanted harassment in pursuit of intimacy, 65.5% of whom were female. Of those victimized by some form of unwanted pursuit, 24 (11.9%) considered such pursuit as threatening, 91.7% of whom were females. As for coping with unwanted pursuit, only those respondents who perceived that they had been harassed or pursued in unwanted ways responded to the coping items. A majority of those responding to unwanted pursuit appeared to rely on moving inward (e.g., ignoring the problem, seeking therapy, minimizing the perceived problem, etc.), moving outward (e.g., engaging social support, seeking sympathy from others, etc.), and moving away (e.g., ignoring the person’s behavior interactionally, using verbal escape tactics, distancing oneself, etc.). It appears that those who experienced unwanted pursuit use a broad range of coping responses, but do not rely on any single one of them extensively.

"Someone is after me! What should I do?"
Coping with Obsessive Relational Pursuit and Stalking in Japan

Your relationship ended a few months ago. It was good while it lasted. You loved him/her, but it
didn't work out. A difference of personalities...different desires. Whatever the reason, s/he is in your past. Or so you thought. You assumed that all communication had ceased but a few weeks later, the phone calls come. S/he calls to see if you are "ok." You get emails concerning your well-being. You think you have seen his/her car drive by your house a couple times over the last week. Unwanted gifts and letters are dropped on your doorstep, unsigned. What will s/he do next? Such a scenario may be exaggerated here, but for many people who experience unwanted pursuit from former relational partners, this is known all too well.

Much has been learned about stalking, harassment, and unwanted relational pursuit in recent years. Although there have been over 150 studies conducted on the various facets of stalking and unwanted pursuit (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2004; Spitzberg, 2002), few have examined any non-Anglo population, and in most cases, stalking was merely a small part of a larger study. Moreover, although demographics have not provided a very clear profile of the stalkers, even less is known about the role of culture in explaining stalking dynamics. Because most of the work done derives from Anglo populations (and since non-Anglo populations often conduct their social and personal relationships in ways divergent from Anglo populations,) it is important that this area of work be taken global. This paper, as a continuation of previous work (Chapman & Spitzberg, 2003; Spitzberg & Chapman, 2004), in one more step in that direction.

This research focuses on stalking and its cousin, unwanted or obsessive relational pursuit (ORI) in Japan. Specifically, we ask how victims cope with unwanted pursuit. To do this, we first define stalking (and ORI), review its prevalence in both societies, and describe stalking tactics commonly used. Academic research on stalking in both populations is included, as well as a review of symptoms and effects experienced by victims. Various mechanisms for coping (and a typology of tactics) are also described. Lastly, a descriptive analysis of Japanese victim's use of coping mechanisms is given, along with implications and suggestions for further research.

The Nature and Prevalence of Stalking and Unwanted Relational Pursuit

Stalking is rarely something that exists only in the past. Once a victim has been pursued, the threat that the pursuer could "strike" (re-enter the victim's life in any way) is a distinct possibility and could, theoretically, occupy the thoughts of the victim every waking day. If the pursuer is not behind bars, physically incapacitated or dead, s/he could forever be the next person behind an unopened door, on the other end of the telephone when it rings, or the person sending the unsolicited, but very personal, emails or SMS messages to the victim. The problem may never go away.

For purposes of this paper, stalking is defined as a persistent pattern of intrusive, harassing, or pursuing behaviors that is unwanted and reasonably interpreted as posing a threat to one's safety (Miller, 2001). That is, stalking is a pattern of unwanted intrusive behavior that induces fear in the victim. The level of fear (and the mechanisms used to deal with it) usually depend on any number of factors, including the nature of the relationship between the pursuer and victim (duration, level of commitment, etc.), and the personality traits of both parties, among others. In short, stalking is a pattern of behavior that stems from varying and often conflicting root motives.

Common stalking tactics include following the victim, repeated and persistent calling or e-mailing, leaving unwanted notes and gifts, proximity intrusions into his/her personal and territorial spaces, lying in wait or observing him/her from a distance, showing up at home, work or school, and
aggressive or continual efforts to contact or intimidate the victim. Stalking takes many forms, but when these behaviors are expressly intended to initiate, revive, repair, or escalate a relationship with the object of pursuit, it is a form of obsessive relational intrusion (Cupach & Spitzberg, 1998; Spitzberg, Nicastro, & Cousins, 1998). Stalking can also be non-relational (as when an assassin stalks a target), or it can come from a stranger. Noted above, stalking usually induces fear while, in contrast, obsessive relational intrusion (ORI) may not. Instead, it may be perceived as annoying or frustrating unwanted pursuit. Research seeking the "level of threat" such behavior causes indicates that relatively low levels of ORI behaviors tend to be perceived as at least moderately threatening, and that a sizable majority of stalking arises from previously established relationships (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2004; Spitzberg, 2002). Thus, stalking and ORI represent substantially overlapping phenomena, and in this paper both will be referred to in this focus of how people cope with such unwanted behaviors.

How common is the experience of stalking and/or unwanted obsessive relational intrusion? Based on a 2002 meta-analysis of 103 studies (with over 68,000 subjects) it was found that:

- approximately 20% of people have experienced being stalked
- roughly 24% of women, and 10% of men have been stalked
- women accounted for 75% of the victims, while men were victims in 25% of the cases
- approximately 50% of stalking experiences arise out of prior romantic relationships (as opposed to dating, or cases of unrequited love)
- roughly 75% of stalking cases stems from a prior acquaintance, while 25% is from strangers (for the full meta-analysis, see Spitzberg, 2002).

Summarized in earlier work by the authors (cf. Chapman & Spitzberg, 2003; Spitzberg & Chapman, 2004), behaviors that make up stalking come in varying forms. Until recently, however, most studies have usually only offered a laundry list of stalking tactics. For more reliable, consistent and comprehensive measures that may be used when assessing risk, intervention and potential law enforcement, a typology of stalking tactics has been developed. Stalking behaviors have been shown to fall into one of seven areas. Described below, the percentage given with each group is a result of a meta-analysis of 43 separate research studies. Stalking tactics include:

- **Hyperintimacy behaviors** (mean = 37%; n = 36): actions that indicate a desire on the part of the pursuer to strengthen the relationship. They include gift giving, contacting the victim in person, leaving written notes, using the phone or email, showing increased signs of affection or physical/sexual approaches, denying the relationship is over or unwanted, etc.

- **Pursuit and surveillance behaviors** (average incidence = 34%; n = 36): actions taken to follow, watch, or in any way get closer or "keep tabs" on the victim, including waiting near or making unexpected visits to the victim's home, school or workplace; following the victim, watching him/her from a distance, etc.

- **Invasion behaviors** (average incidence = 24%; n = 30): behaviors that physically invade the victim's personal space or privacy. These may include breaking into the victim's home or car, trespassing at his/her home, theft of personal information or mail, vandalism of personal property, etc., These types of behaviors often break laws, and may invite legal action more readily than other behaviors (also see "aggressive" behaviors below).

- **Proxy pursuit and/or intrusion behaviors** (average incidence = 54%; n = 14): such behaviors
entail using a third party (friends, classmates or co-workers, etc.) to gather information for the pursuer.

- **Intimidating and harassing behaviors** (average incidence = 28%; n = 39): these actions may come in the form of oral, written or physical harassment. They may be threats to do physical harm to the victim or the victim's friends, family, associates and even pets; threats to damage the victim's reputation, threats to actually involve the victim's associates or friends in his/her relational problems, or a threat on the part of the pursuer to physically harm (or kill) him/her self as a response to being rejected.

- **Coercion and constraint** (average incidence = 20%; n = 9): these behaviors are attempts by the pursuer to physically alter the victim's life via limiting his/her options. Use of physical force to restrain or kidnap falls into this category (at the extreme end of behaviors), but coercion and manipulating the victim into dating (or negotiating the status of the relationship) also fall into this area.

- **Aggressive behaviors** (incidence of physical violence = 33%, n = 42; incidence of sexual violence = 11%, n = 17): these involve the use of physical violence (toward the body or property) and/or sexual violence, many times resulting in laws being broken. Examples include assault on the victim (or the pursuer through self-injury) as well as physical harm to the victims' loved ones, or even pets (note that "harassing" behaviors above include the threat of assault, yet in aggressive behaviors, the threat is carried out). Also, the pursuer may do property damage to the victim's home or car. (see Cupach & Spitzberg, 2004; Spitzberg, 2002 for more details).

As for prevalence of violence (or stalking tactics that attempt some form of violence), roughly one-third of stalking relationships are likely to involve violence, but this proportion increases to more than 50% if there was previous sexual or romantic involvement, as opposed to being stalked by a stranger or non-romantic acquaintance (Meloy, 2002; Cupach & Spitzberg, 2004). Women are found to make up approximately 75% of victims, and not surprisingly men comprise roughly 80% of the stalkers (Budd & Mattinson, 2000; Cupach & Spitzberg, 2004; Elliott & Brantley, 1997; Fisher et al., 2000; Hackett, 2000; Kohn, et al., 2000; Kong, 1996; McLennan, 1995/96, 1996; Purcell et al., 2002; Spitzberg, 2002). However, these gender ratios may be biased by different processes. For example, males tend not to feel as threatened by the same ORI behaviors females find threatening, especially when it is a female doing the pursuing (Sinclair & Friese, 2000; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000).

As for frequency of stalking, women have a prevalence range from 8%-25% where as 2%-15% of men have reported suffering the experience (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2004). The average length of time victims report being stalked is nearly two years (Spitzberg, 2002). Wherever the stalking takes place, the stalkers are generally younger rather than older, they tend to be smarter and more educated than typical criminals, and they often have a prior criminal record (see Meloy, 1996; Mullen, Pathé, & Purcell, 2000; Cupach & Spitzberg, 2004). Given the clear existence of stalking, in all its forms, and the related concept of ORI, this paper now turns to a review of the effects and symptoms experienced by victims.
Symptoms of Stalking Victimization

Limited evidence indicates stalking victimization tends to be highly traumatizing and psychologically deleterious (Coker, Davis, Arias, Desai, Sanderson, Brandt, & Smith, 2002; Cupach & Spitzberg, 2004; Dye & Davis, 2003; Mechanic, Uhlmannsiek, Weaver, & Resick, 2000). A recent typology of symptoms (Spitzberg, 2002) experienced by victims include the following problems and effects:

- **General disturbance & distress:** including posttraumatic stress syndrome, being emotionally and/or psychologically injured, suffering undue worry and general restlessness, uneasiness with one's quality of life, etc.
- **Affective symptoms:** experiencing anxiety, anger, paranoia, depression, intimidation, jealousy, being annoyed, afraid, etc.
- **Cognitive health symptoms:** stemming from feelings the victim self-conceptualizes, these include decreased or loss of self-esteem and self-confidence, feeling distrustful, having a sense of being powerless and/or helpless, feeling suspicious, confused, or suicidal (as a direct response to the unwanted pursuit), etc.
- **Physical health symptoms:** alcohol and/or drug abuse, loss of or negatively affected appetite, lack of sleep, feeling nauseous or physically ill, attempted suicide (as a direct response to the pursuit), etc.
- **Social health:** symptoms that reflect a change in lifestyle, such as increased aggression, avoidance of certain people and/or places, cautiousness, going out less, deteriorating relationships with others, school or work-related problems, etc.
- **Resource health:** effects that result in tangible "costs" at work (loss of work time, unpaid leave) school absences, etc.
- **Resilience health:** turning into oneself (self-reliance), or close friends or family and strengthening one's self-concept, one's relations with others, finding unknown capabilities within oneself. (This group of symptoms was reported least of all the effects, in only one study out of 19 analyzed).

As this typology of symptoms suggest, victims experience a wide variety of potentially negative effects. In fact, the dizzying choices for how a person reacts to unwanted pursuit may be as varying as the amount of tactics the pursuer takes! As will be described later, the choice a victim makes when reacting and/or coping with ORI depends on different factors.

Does Culture Matter?

Japan has high population homogeneity. In fact, only 1% of the population is non-Japanese (various groups make up the other 1%: Korean, 511, 262; Chinese, 244, 241; Brazilian, 182, 232; Filipino, 89, 851; other, 237,914. World Factbook: Japan, 2004). This homogeneity has led to a strong sense of patriarchal social order, as well as a sensitivity to the "in-group" (across social situations, informal, formal business settings, etc.) while the passive religious influences of Buddhism and Shintoism have led to people seeing the "self" as interdependent with the larger social and natural context. The Japanese character is often described as following a system of honor based on the "in-group" hierarchy (in both personal, familial settings as well as in formal business environments), and the overall role or status of people in society. They rely more on nonverbal- and context-based forms of communication,
and relationships are valued above the individual. (It must be noted that this is a cursory review of the Japanese character, given that a thorough examination of various cultural factors that may influence Japanese behaviors was done in the author's previous work. See Chapman & Spitzberg, 2003; Spitzberg & Chapman, 2004).

While a generalization of such characteristics (a preference for social harmony, various "face saving" tactics that avoid social shame, avoidance and accommodation behaviors, rather than assertive or competitive strategies, to reduce in-group conflict, etc.) may lead to the prediction that stalking would be uncharacteristic of Japanese, previous research confirms that the problem of stalking and OR1 exists (Chapman & Spitzberg, 2003). From an opposite perspective, however, it could be argued that due to the possibility of being viewed negatively by society (and a persons' in-group) that a victim of stalking behavior would hesitate to report the intrusive behavior in order to avoid any consequences. However, some of these very same cultural tendencies could be interpreted conversely. That is, "a highly ritualized social order that is also masculine or patriarchal could lead to an implicit assumption by males in particular that persistent, even aggressive, pursuit of partners is acceptable. Furthermore, shaming could become a mechanism of control by which the pursuer attempts to shame the pursued into compliance and romance" (Chapman & Spitzberg, 2003, p. 92; cf Zhang, 1995).

The traits of the Japanese lead to a few questions regarding coping with unwanted pursuit: Do people in Japan, when they know they are being pursued, and perceive it as stalking, tell anyone? Is there a "shame" factor? Or do they accept it because publicizing it would be "disruptive" to the social harmony? If they do react, do they only "report" it to friends and/or loved ones (keeping it in their immediate social circle)? Or do they take more assertive, retaliatory measures? Japanese do not appear to differ much from Koreans or Southeast Asians in their perceptions of the seriousness or dynamics of, or responses to, sexual violence (Lee & Law, 2001). Yet little has been done on how Japanese cope with unwanted pursuit. This paper now turns to that area: stalking and unwanted pursuit in Japan, and measures taken to cope with it.

**Increased Stalking Reports in Japan**

Few studies have been conducted on stalking in non-Anglo populations. In Cupach and Spitzberg's (2004) summary of 149 samples (across 143 studies), 104 (70%) were done in the U.S., 14 (9%) were Australian, 11 (7%) were British, 8 (5%) were Canadian, 2 (1%) were European, 2 (1%) were Japanese, and 1 was Caribbean (8 were unclassifiable). Yet, those that have been done deserve mention here. We know stalking and OR1 is not a peculiarly "Western" (or Anglo) phenomenon. Stalking became a law in the U.S. for the first time in 1990 (in California), and as a punishable offense it became a Japanese law 10 years later (in May 2000, taking effect in November of that same year). In that Japanese law, stalking was defined as "a persistent pattern of action that prevents the victim from leading a safe and normal existence" (Matsumoto, 2002, p. 1). When narrowing the actions that can be construed as stalking, the Japanese law stipulates the following eight behaviors: a) following the victim, waiting for them or physically blocking their way; b) telling the victim his/her every move is being observed; c) making demands to meet or form a relationship; d) using abusive language and/or engaging in similarly abusive behaviors; e) making phone calls and/or sending repeated faxes that harass the victim; f) sending materials through the mail that include excrement, dead animals or "other unpleasant objects"; g) defamation; and h) sexual harassment (see Matsumoto, 2002).
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Since then, stalking has been in the news more and more in Japan. After stalking became illegal, other cases have been well publicized and have, in turn, increased public awareness (see "Slain," 2004; "Killer," 2003; "Parents Held," 2003; "Unemployed Man," 2003; "Stalker Fatally Cuts," 2003, "Police Ignored," 2003; "Stalker Gets 13 Years," 2003; "Complaints," 2001 & Wijers-Hasegawa, 2003). Furthermore, since the National Police Agency started keeping records of stalking complaints in 1997, an average of 6,000 more complaints have come in each year (Tashiro, 2000). A 2003 report shows arrests of stalkers rose more than 25% to 2002 (from the 2000 date of the anti-stalking enactment, "Stalker Crackdown," 2003). In the Japanese population, over 88% of victims were women. Like statistics from Anglo-populations, males were the stalkers in the vast majority of cases (89.6%), and of these victims, the majority (over 54%) knew their pursuer from previous romantic relationships.

**Academic Research on Stalking in Japan**

Before a discussion is given on all the possible responses to coping with unwanted pursuit, we must first review the academic work on stalking and ORI experiences in Japan. Few studies have done research on stalking in Asian populations, and fewer on Japan. On a sample of almost 800 Japanese women, Yoshihama and Sorenson (1994) reported that over 75% of subjects experienced at least one type of intimate aggression (e.g., 76% physical, 77% sexual, 85% emotional) from a male partner (extraordinarily high relative to percentages in the U.S. See Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998a & 1998b). Abuse tactics described as "emotional" included confining the victim to her home (9.4%), restricted/prohibited contacts with family/friends (43.8%), excessively checking up on the victim when going out or using the phone, opening the victim’s letters without permission (30.4%), and following, calling repeatedly (at home or work; 15.3%).

Yokoi (1998) investigated stalking cases and revealed typical aspects of stalking (e.g., destruction of property, intimidation, theft, sexual assault or rape), but lower levels of threat and physical assault than is typical of stalking in the U.S. Victims were stalked by strangers (23.5%) with ex-boy/girlfriends or ex-spouses representing nearly 59% of cases. Suzuki (1999) found that 7.2% of Japanese females (out of 600) had experienced stalking. The relationships between pursuers and victims were strangers (30.2%), previous romantic partners (25.6%) or acquaintances from school or work (18.6%). Intrusive tactics reported included calls to the victim’s home, work or pager (the most frequent at 54.9%), mail and letters (11.8%), following (32.4%), visiting home or work (27.5%), waiting on the way home (40.2%), shadowing or watching (30.4%), sending gifts (6.9%), theft (3.9%), and observing from a distance (11.8%).

Omata (2002) surveyed over 400 female Japanese junior college students and found that nearly 17% of respondents experienced persistent stalking (in the form of the pursuer waiting at or near the victim’s home), while approximately three-fourths of the subjects experienced those incidents more than once (not surprising given the repetitive nature of unwanted intrusions. The caller rarely calls once!) The unique aspect of this work was that only one-third (31.9%) of the victims were acquainted with their pursuer, as opposed to a much higher average in U.S. populations (Spitzberg, 2002, reports 75% of the pursuers being prior acquaintances).

In very recent work done by the authors comparing Japanese subjects with a U.S. sample, results indicate that stalking clearly exists in both populations, although the amount of stalking was not as high
(frequent) in the Japanese population (Chapman & Spitzberg, 2003). Subjects were asked “During some period of my life I have experienced being followed and/or harassed and/or obsessively pursued by someone” with the U.S. subjects answering they were “persistently pursued” more than the Japanese (47.6% to 20.3%, respectively). Gender differences showed that 17.9% of all males and 22.2% of females in the Japanese sample indicated they had been pursued in unwanted ways (vs. 47.4% and 57.5% for the U.S., respectively). Both populations viewed the behaviors as stalking (Japanese, 34%; U.S., 41.2%), yet the Japanese perceived the behavior they experienced as more “threatening” (51.1%) than their U.S. counterparts (41.2%). When the genders are broken down, Japanese males perceived the behavior as “threatening” (40%) as opposed to the U.S. males (only 11.1% felt the intrusion was “threatening”).

The average duration of Japanese who had been pursued was nearly 5 months, with the frequency of ORI behaviors they experienced being nearly 7 times a month. As for the relationship between the pursuer and victim, of those who responded to this question, 22% were strangers, 50% were friends, nearly 17% were either casually or seriously dating (n = 3), and 11% indicated “other.” The sex of the pursuer was 64% male, with the 36% remaining consisting of female pursuers.

Regarding the types of stalking behaviors experienced by the Japanese, the non-physical behavior of sending “affection messages” (e.g., romantically-oriented notes, cards, letters, voice-mail, e-mail, messages with friends, etc.) was most prevalent in both populations, yet some cultural differences between the cultures can be seen. Japanese reported some physically intrusive behaviors as being more frequent. They include sexual coercion, being watched, being physically threatened, being physically hurt and having ones’ personal property invaded. These results may help explain why the Japanese felt, overall, that their experiences were more threatening than did U.S. subjects. Lastly, when the respondents were asked if they, themselves, had “ever engaged in romantic pursuit in ways that a reasonable person might consider to be stalking,” a surprising 10.3% of Japanese affirmed they had (Chapman & Spitzberg, 2003; Spitzberg & Chapman, 2004). As this work and work mentioned above (Omata, 2002; Suzuki, 1999 and Yokoi, 1998) confirm, stalking is not unique to Anglo populations (for results on a Caribbean population, see Jagessar & Sheridan, 2002; for Iranian subjects, see Kordvani, 2000, cited in Spitzberg, 2002). So how do victims cope?

Coping Research: On the Need to Help Victims

Obsessive and unwanted relational intrusion is not unusual, and it results in a varying number of undesirable consequences. ORI behaviors can be said to reflect a relationship between people whose relational goals are incompatible. Understanding the behaviors that help people cope with this unfortunate behavior is necessary to reach a better understanding of the nature of relationships themselves, and manage them when they go off track. Victims of these behaviors often find themselves with opposing reactions: take action and risk retaliation on the part of the pursuer, or take no action and give the pursuer the impression that his/her pursuits are not unwanted, thereby (indirectly) encouraging him/her to continue. Does the victim turn inside and rationalize the pursuit, seek solace or answers through some type of “self-help?” Or does s/he turn outward, relying on friends, family or others (e.g. counselors) to cope? More active choices may include varying forms of avoidance, confrontation or retaliation.
Responses to Obsessive Relational Intrusion

When it comes to ORI specifically, there is little academic research to indicate how victims of this behavior react. It could be argued that there are as many ways to react as there are types of unwanted behaviors to suffer from. Factors that may affect the type of reaction include the personality and tactics used by the pursuer, the personality of the victim, and, of course, the nature of the relationship (or prior relationship) between the pursuer and the victim.

Related to ORI, research on people who have their privacy violated, and their responses (their efforts at restoring their privacy) yielded some broad responses: control the interaction (e.g., don't talk and/or reduce involvement in any conversations with the pursuer), dyadic intimacy strategies (e.g. strike or push the pursuer away, threaten him/her with physical violence), use of negative expressions of arousal (e.g. show anger or irritation and/or yell at the pursuer), engage in avoidance and blocking strategies (put physical barriers between the victim and pursuer, or simply avoid direct eye contact), practice distancing (e.g. put physical space between the parties, give no reactions to pursuers behaviors), and confrontation (directly tell the pursuer to stay away, express dislike at his/her pursuits) (see Burgoon, Parrott, LePoire, Kelley, Walther & Parry, 1989, cited in Cupach & Spitzberg, 1998). Another study on the reactions of women who were harassed by former dating partners after a breakup showed various responses: doing nothing (32%), talking to someone (e.g. friends, family, a counselor / therapist, 54%), changing something in their personal environment (e.g. moving, 19%), and showing anger and becoming distant toward the person who harassed them (8%) (Jason, Reichler, Easton, Neal & Wilson, 1984).

In research on responses to unwanted ORI, one thing must be asked: what responses are effective toward coping with unwanted behaviors? Passive or assertive responses? Which tactics yield better results? That is, if one is subject to, for example, direct intrusions into his/her privacy, is the best response avoidance (i.e. a passive response) or direct (i.e. assertive in the form of direct face-to-face interaction with the pursuer?). Werner and Haggard (1992) did research that indicated people dealing with undesired intrusions in an office environment reacted in "indirect" ways such as simply avoiding and rejecting the unwanted behaviors. Bratslavsky, Baumeister and Sommer (1998) note that people who want to reject unwanted pursuit (or, in their research study, "unrequited love") have few guidelines to choose from with respect to rejecting such behavior.

As an early step toward studying and categorizing the different responses to ORI, Spitzberg and Cupach (1996) collected data on the frequency of responses targets used against unwanted intrusions (also see Spitzberg, Marshall & Cupach, 1997). Analysis yielded five groups of responses: direct interaction with the pursuer (e.g. speak with the pursuer face-to-face, tell the pursuer his/her behavior is wrong and unwanted, etc.); protection (e.g. call law enforcement, change jobs, etc.); avoidance strategies (e.g. avoid direct or indirect communication with the pursuer, including eye contact, interaction, common activities where both parties may be present, etc.); engage in retaliation measures (e.g. physically "attack" the person, bring public shame or embarrassment on him/her, etc.); and use technology (e.g. the telephone call-back feature, caller ID, etc.). Similar responses were found in research done by Cupach and Spitzberg (1997b, cited in Cupach & Spitzberg, 1998). On campus colleges, Fremouw, Westrup and Pennypacker (1997) found the most common coping strategies for men and women stalking victims were direct confrontation or avoidance (i.e. ignore the stalker).

Interestingly, Bratslavsky, et al (1998) note that the responses of the victims have showed an
"unwillingness to hurt another person [which] led them to behave in a considerate and warm manner, and this in turn was probably taken as a sign of encouragement by the would-be lovers. . . . rejecters [victims] are reluctant to send a hurtful rejection message, and would-be lovers are reluctant to receive it" (p. 321). This type of situation could be described as the victim finding a "silver lining" in his/her ordeal, and this could be used to rationalize the unwanted behavior, leading to little, if any, response. So is the soft response "safe"? Jason, et al (1984) argued that assertive reactions on the part of women were no better at stemming the unwanted pursuit than were passive responses. Where does that leave the victims, male or female? Some coping mechanisms may invite further taunting, but doing nothing has the potential to escalate the already unwanted pursuit. With this review of coping tactics from western (Anglo) subjects given, we turn to what tactics Japanese victims have used to cope.

**Coping with Unwanted Relational Pursuit in Japan**

Fortunately, awareness of the problem is increasing in Japan. Dealing with it, however, has been much slower than other industrialized countries. It has been argued that Japanese tradition gives men greater "control" over women, due to the passiveness of society (Chapman & Spitzberg, 2003). It is also a common belief, and academic research has shown, that Japanese tend to prefer 'passive-withdrawal' strategies when confronted with threats to one's self. In contrast, people in North America prefer 'active-aggressive' strategies (cf. Barnlund, 1989; Gudykunst & Nishida, 1994). When a Japanese person experiences unwanted relational pursuit in any form, what are the options? How do victims react? Yokoi (1998) reported victim's responses as follows: experiencing nervousness (20.6%), fear and anxiety (45.1%), depression (43.9%), anger toward the stalker (47.1%), making changes in one's lifestyle (13.7%), making a change in the job or home (5.9%), and having an inability to focus on studies or work (7.8%). The overwhelming majority of victims (87.3%) did not contact the police.

Omata (2002) reported victim's responses to the unwanted pursuit as doing nothing (19.4%), seeking advice (47.2%) and "fighting off the assailant" (23.6%), with the remaining subjects reporting other tactics (e.g. reporting to "authorities"). These effects of victimization in Japan are in line with other studies of symptomology, including avoiding the victimization scene (33.3%), greater distrust of men (31.9%), involuntary flashback of memory (29.2%), increased self-hatred (11.1%), loss of self-confidence (11.1%), greater distrust of teacher (in teacher/student dyads; 9.7%), lowered general motivation (8.3%), lowered learning motivation (8.3%), decreased social interaction (8.3%), and a miscellany of other effects (see Chapman & Spitzberg, 2003).

In addition to this very limited academic research on coping and symptoms of victims in Japan, a few popular news reports are worth mentioning. In a highly publicized case (that became the catalyst for making stalking a crime in Japan) where unwanted pursuit led to the murder of a 20-year-old female college student, it turned out that when she did complain to police, they did nothing since her arguments and incidents of attacks were viewed "not sufficient enough" to take action. As a result, it was later claimed, that may have prevented other women from telling authorities their experiences (see Wijers-Hasegawa, 2003). When the battle is finally won (and the victim survives), it may also turn out that fighting unwanted pursuit does not come cheap. In Okayama prefecture (western Japan), one woman won her court case against the pursuer (after 26 years of harassment), but her village did not welcome her hard-fought victory (Tashiro, 2000). People sympathized with the stalker,
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saying to her "you've gone too far." In the end, she was forced to leave the area because people accused her of bringing shame to herself and people in the nearby area. In Japanese culture, Tashiro (2000) adds, bringing a loss of face "by fingering a relative or neighbor is often seen as worse than the crime itself" (p. 37). In a country where conformity in a group, and the strong yet unspoken need to preserve harmony ("wa / 和") in society, being a victim can often mean turning inward and keeping the fact to yourself.

In sum, previous research has led to a laundry list of varying responses victims may choose from when coping with stalking and/or ORI. What tactics they choose to act upon, as noted, may depend on many factors (the stalking tactics used, the characters of both the victim and pursuer, the nature and length of previous relationship, among others). Until recently, these various options had not been categorized, and better understood, in such a way that would allow for better assessment of the victim's behaviors as well as the connection between coping behaviors and any increase or decrease in the stalker's behavior. The next part of this paper discusses efforts made to create a typology of coping mechanisms. Such a typology could lead to more thorough advice and intervention approaches to help victims.

Toward a Typology of Coping Mechanisms

Work by Cupach & Spitzberg (2000) on coping strategies asked subjects about coping with the invasion of "one's sense of physical or symbolic privacy by another person" and found four groups of reactions: interaction, protection, retaliation and evasion. Further work by Spitzberg & Cupach (2001) and Spitzberg (2002) on a meta-analysis of 15 different studies dealing specifically with coping tactics resulted in a typology of response orientations on the part of victims: moving away from the pursuer (avoidance), moving with / toward the pursuer (renegotiate), moving against (retaliation), moving inward (self-empowerment or self-actualization) or moving outward (seek help from others). This 5-group typology is described in detail below (additional examples of how each behavior may be manifested is found in the questionnaire in Appendix B (English), as it was used for data collection in this study). Coping tactics include:

Moving inward: The victim ignores, minimizes or denies it happened in her/his head; s/he places blame on her/himself, or seeks "therapy" in some new activity. S/he tries to explain the problem to her/himself or "explains" the problem in the context of religion or a new "philosophical" approach. In serious cases, the victim tries to self-destruct via drugs, alcohol or self-induced physical injury (or suicide).

Moving outward: The victim seeks support from outside. S/he desires sympathy from peers and social support (from friends or professionals). S/he looks for more direct involvement from others to stop the intrusion, from family and/or friends, as well as via professional support groups (i.e. victim's groups, a public attorney) or from private professionals (bodyguard, private detective, etc.). These could be described as protective strategies.

Moving away: This involves the victim engaging in avoidance or evasion strategies such as changing daily routines, ignoring or distancing her/himself from the victim; if contact is made, s/he tries to control (or avoid) direct interaction, may become unemotional and impersonal or change the pursuers point of interest. Similar actions include verbally escaping the situation, decreasing or blocking access to the victim (via physical and/or electronic means). Lastly, it could be physically moving and directly
claiming the relationship is over. (This group has the largest number of behavioral choices).

**Moving toward / with**: Generally defined as engaging or interacting with the pursuer, the victim may deceive the stalker or reduce the seriousness of the relationship. S/he could negotiate an amicable conclusion and/or the definition of the relationship itself (e.g. “let’s just be friends now”). Lastly, the victim may bargain and/or accept promises or hope that the situation will remedy itself.

**Moving against**: Seen as retaliatory, the victim may use nonverbal aggression, direct legal action (i.e. call the police) or use electronic media to inflict damage on the pursuer (attack his/her web site, etc.) or protect oneself (e.g. block email access). The victim may also give direct verbal threats before resorting to physical violence and, lastly, make a case and pursue legal action in the courts. (See Cupach & Spitzberg, 2004, and Spitzberg, 2002, for further details on this typology).

From among these coping responses, one has received a lot of attention in recent years in stalking and domestic violence reports, that of seeking legal action (in the above typology, moving against or retaliating). In this area, the most common response of the victim is to ask for protective orders from the courts. This type of action starts with a temporary restraining order, which depending on the circumstances, can be extended. Like other strategies for coping with the pursuit, it must be asked how effective is such a strategy? A comprehensive study by Klein (1996) found that nearly half of the victims suffered further abuse within 2 years of having the restraining order served. That same year Harrell and Smith (1996) also found that more than half of women victims who obtained restraining orders against their abusers experienced “unwanted contacts” in the first 3 months. Such unwanted intrusions included telephone calls, being tracked, followed or stalked, and having the pursuer visit the victim’s home. The meta-analysis mentioned earlier noted that of 32 studies, research found that stalkers violated their restraining orders roughly 40% of the time, and such restraining orders were actually followed by an increase in violence or stalking 21% of the time (Spitzberg, 2002). The effectiveness of the restraining order may depend on the level of emotional investment the pursuer has made. That is to say, as de Becker (1997) notes, court orders served upon the pursuer earlier, before s/he has spent an inordinate amount of time and/or introduced threats and more escalated behaviors, have a better chance of reducing the unwanted behavior than if the victim was already abused. Given the unclear effectiveness of taking legal action, it may be best for the pursuer to think twice before going that far. Again, the choice of coping tactics used depends on varying factors that may need extensive assessment before taking action.

In summary, stalking and unwanted relational pursuit is not a uniquely Anglo problem. We know it pervades cultures, even if academic research on non-Anglo cultures is limited. Despite a variety of cultural differences between Japan and Anglo cultures, more information is needed on this problem in Japan, including what measures victims take to cope with stalking and ORI. The research done here aims to increase the knowledge of coping tactics used in response to ORI in a Japanese population. We ask: What is the prevalence of stalking and obsessive relational intrusion in a sample Japanese population, and what measures are used on the part of the victims to cope with the unwanted intrusion?

**Method**

A convenience sample of data from Japanese subjects was collected from 201 undergraduates at one
small, private university and one mid-sized public university in Western Japan. There were 54 males (27%) and 147 females (73%). The vast majority (90.5%) reported a college level education, and only 15% reported some job status other than "student." The surveys were distributed and the data was collected from July to September, 2004. All responses were anonymous.

The ORI survey, written in Japanese (see Appendix A), was a previously used questionnaire (Chapman & Spitzberg, 2003) of a U.S. stalking and ORI victimization (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2004) that had been translated, and cross-translated from the English version (see Appendix B) by three native-Japanese speakers, all fluent in the English language. The English Obsessive Relational Intrusion survey (ORI), (© Spitzberg & Cupach, 1997) consisted of a series of 43 closed-ended and open-ended questions pertaining to student’s past experience with stalking and/or behavior they deemed to be stalking. The first 28 items consisted of a type of cluster item, in which a generic tactic of pursuit is described followed by a parenthetical set of exemplars. For example, the item on “following behavior” is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has anyone ever undesirably &amp; obsessively pursued you by...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. FOLLOWING YOU AROUND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., following you to or from work, school, home, gym, daily activities, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The response scale ranges from never (0), only once (1), 2-3 times (2), 4-5 times (3), to over 5 times (4). This measure has been used in several studies on U.S. college populations, and was developed to represent the entire continuum of mild to severe types of unwanted pursuit, intrusion, and stalking (see Spitzberg, 2002). The ORI survey also asked about frequency of such behaviors, sex of the perceived perpetrator, the relationship between the "stalkers" and the "victims" as well as the length of time the offending behavior occurred. (It should be noted, however, that the Japanese version had four additional questions related to demographics of the subjects including age, job status/school status, highest level of education, and average annual income. These additional questions resulted in a total of 47 questions in the Japanese questionnaire, as seen in Appendix A).

In addition to the ORI, a 40-item coping response questionnaire, (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2004) was included (which had been translated and cross-translated into Japanese by three native-Japanese speakers, all fluent in the English language, see the second half of Appendix B for "coping" questions). These questions asked subjects to respond to their experiences of being obsessively intruded upon, pursued, harassed, or stalked in an unwanted way. The items represent several types of responses that people may or may not have used in an effort to cope with the unwanted pursuit. For each behavior, they were asked to indicate the extent to which they used the coping tactic. For example, the item on “engage social support” is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>While this person was pursuing you, did you ever...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. ENGAGE SOCIAL SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., seek or obtain emotional and/or instrumental support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from friends, family, counselor, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The response scale ranges from never (0), occasionally (1), often (2), very often (3), to constantly...
The coping questionnaire grouped the behaviors into a priori set of functional subscales representing 5 basic modes of coping with problems (detailed earlier in this paper): moving inward, moving outward, moving away, moving toward/with and moving against (cf. Cupach & Spitzberg, 2004; Spitzberg, 2002).

Results and Discussion

One estimate of victimization is to assess nominal self-recognition of victimization. In this sample, 54 (26.9%) reported some unwanted harassment in pursuit of intimacy, 65.5% of whom were female. Of those victimized by some form of unwanted pursuit, 24 (11.9%) considered such pursuit as threatening, 91.7% of whom were females. Finally, of those who were pursued in a threatening manner, 12 considered it stalking (6.0%), of whom 83.3% were female. Of those reporting the sex of the stalker, 76.9% were reported to be males. Furthermore, 42.9% of those stalked believed the pursuer had stalked others. The prior relationship status of these 12 stalkers consisted of 3 (25%) serious dating, 7 (58.3%) friend, 1 (8.3%) college or service relationship, and 1 (8.3%) stranger. Surprisingly, of those surveyed, 42 (20.9%) admitted to have engaged in stalking someone, and 78.6% of those claiming to have stalked others were females. Of those reporting on the duration of unwanted pursuit \( (n = 40) \), the average duration was 8.2 months, and the unwanted pursuit is reported to have occurred an average of 28 months prior to the time of the survey. Of the 11 respondents who claimed to have been stalked, there was an average of 5.09 episodes of pursuit per month.

Another way of assessing victimization is to ascertain specific experience of behaviors that meet scholarly or legal conceptions of stalking or obsessive relational intrusion, but may not raise to the victim's own recognition as threatening or illegal. The percentages of respondents who have experienced at least one instance of each of the 28 tactics of obsessive relational intrusion or stalking is presented in Table 1.

### TABLE 1

**Descending percentages of respondents who experienced at least one instance of unwanted pursuit by tactic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tactic</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAVING UNWANTED MESSAGES OF AFFECTION</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., romantically-oriented notes, cards, letters, voice-mail, e-mail, messages with friends, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVADING YOUR PERSONAL SPACE</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., getting too close to you in conversation, touching you, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRUDING UNINVITED INTO YOUR INTERACTIONS</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., “hovers” around your conversations, offers unsolicited advice, initiates conversations when you are clearly busy, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAVING UNWANTED GIFTS</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., flowers, stuffed animals, photographs, jewelry, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COVERTLY OBTAINING PRIVATE INFORMATION
(e.g., listening to your message machine, taking photos of you without your knowledge, stealing your mail or e-mail, etc.) 18.0%

FOLLOWING YOU AROUND
(e.g., following you to or from work, school, home, gym, daily activities, etc.) 17.4%

WATCHING YOU
(e.g., driving by home or work, watching from a distance, gazing at you in public places, etc.) 17.4%

MAKING EXAGGERATED EXPRESSIONS OF AFFECTION
(e.g., saying "I love you" after limited interaction, doing large and unsolicited favors for you, etc.) 16.9%

INVADING YOUR PROPERTY
(e.g., breaking and entering your home, car, desk, backpack or briefcase, etc.) 14.0%

SEXUALLY COERCING YOU
(e.g., forcefully attempted/succeeded in kissing, feeling, or disrobing you, exposed him/herself, forced sexual behavior, etc.) 13.9%

APPROACHING OR SURPRISING YOU IN PUBLIC PLACES
(e.g., showing up at places such as stores, work, gym; lying in wait around corners, etc.) 13.4%

INVADING YOUR PERSONAL PROPERTY
(e.g., handling your possessions, breaking and entering into your home, showing up at your door or car, etc.) 12.9%

MONITORING YOU AND/OR YOUR BEHAVIOR
(e.g., calling at all hours to check on your whereabouts, checking up on you through mutual friends, etc.) 12.4%

PHYSICALLY RESTRAINING YOU
(e.g., grabbing your arm, blocking your progress, holding your car door while you’re in the car, etc.) 10.0%

INTRUDING UPON YOUR FRIENDS, FAMILY OR COWORKERS
(e.g., trying to befriend your friends, family or coworkers; seeking to be invited to social events, seeking employment at your work, etc.) 9.5%

LEAVING UNWANTED THREATENING MESSAGES
(e.g., hang-up calls; notes, cards, letters, voice-mail, e-mail, messages with friends, implying harm or potential harm, etc.) 9.5%

VERBALLY THREATENING YOU PERSONALLY
(e.g., threats or vague warnings that something bad will happen to you, threatening personally to hurt you, etc.) 8.0%

ENGAGING IN REGULATORY HARASSMENT
(e.g., filing official complaints, spreading false rumors to officials – boss, instructor, etc., obtaining a restraining order on you, etc.) 7.5%

THREATENING OTHERS YOU CARE ABOUT
(e.g., threatening harm to or making vague warnings about romantic partners, friends, family, pets, etc.) 7.0%
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THREATENING TO HURT HIM-OR HERSELF
(e.g., vague threats that something bad will happen to him-or herself, threatening to commit suicide, etc.) 6.5%

SHOWING UP AT PLACES IN THREATENING WAYS
(e.g., showing up at class, office or work, from behind a corner, staring from across a street, being inside your home, etc.) 6.5%

PHYSICALLY THREATENING YOU
(e.g., throwing something at you, acting as if s/he will hit you, running finger across neck implying throat slitting, etc.) 6.5%

PHYSICALLY HURTING YOU
(e.g., pushing or shoving you, slapping you, hitting you with fist, hitting you with an object, etc.) 6.0%

STEALING OR DAMAGING VALUED POSSESSIONS
(e.g., you found property vandalized; things missing, damaged or hurt that only this person had access to, such as prior gifts, pets, etc.) 5.5%

KIDNAPPING OR PHYSICALLY CONSTRAINING YOU
(e.g., by force or threat of force, trapped you in a car or room; bound you; took you places against your will; etc.) 1.0%

LEAVING OR SENDING YOU THREATENING OBJECTS
(e.g., marked up photographs, photographs taken of you without your knowledge, pornography, weapons, etc.) 1.0%

PHYSICALLY ENDANGERING YOUR LIFE
(e.g., trying to run you off the road, displaying a weapon in front of you, using a weapon to subdue you, etc.) 0.5%

For the most part, the pattern reflects a common trend of victimization prevalence, namely, that the more minor or subtle forms of victimization are more prominent, and prevalence tapers off significantly as the seriousness of the activity increases. In other words, prevalence generally is inversely related to seriousness of the type of victimization. A second result of these analyses that typifies other types of intimate violence is that victimization tends to be more prominent at the behavioral level than at the nominal labeling level. That is, asking people if they have been obsessively harassed or stalked tends to produce smaller prevalence estimates than asking if they have experienced specific behaviors and instances of such phenomena.

Only those respondents who perceived that they had been harassed or pursued in unwanted ways responded to the coping items. The prevalence with which various coping tactics were employed is displayed in Table 2, by the general strategy of coping.
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TABLE 2

Descending percentages (within category) of respondents who employed coping tactics in response to unwanted pursuit by individual tactic

MOVING INWARD:

IGNORE THE PROBLEM
(e.g., wait, assume problem will go away on its own, etc.) 74.8%

MINIMIZE THE PROBLEM IN YOUR OWN MIND
(e.g., rationalize that the problem is less significant or serious than it actually is, etc.) 70.5%

SEEK THERAPIES
(e.g., invest time and effort into hobbies, drugs, exercise, medicine, therapeutic activities such as massage, meditation, exercise, watch television, internet, etc.) 68.9%

SEEK MEANING IN GENERAL
(e.g., invest time and effort into making sense of your situation, trying to find a reason, etc.) 63.9%

DENY THE PROBLEM
(e.g., refuse to acknowledge the problem at all; rationalize alternative explanations for experiences, etc.) 48.3%

BLAME YOURSELF
(e.g., attribute responsibility for problems to self actions or perceptions, etc.) 38.3%

SEEK MEANING IN CONTEXT
(e.g., invest time & effort into religion, philosophy, education, literature, etc.) 11.5%

ENGAGE IN SELF-DESTRUCTIVE ESCAPISM
(e.g., using drugs or alcohol, doing addictive things, attempting suicide, etc.) 6.7%

MOVING OUTWARD:

ENGAGE SOCIAL SUPPORT
(e.g., seek or obtain emotional and/or instrumental support from friends, family, counselor, etc.) 67.8%

SEEK SYMPATHY FROM OTHERS
(e.g., cry, explain personal problems caused by the pursuer, etc.) 39.3%

ENGAGE DIRECT INVOLVEMENT OF OTHERS
(e.g., seek or obtain protection or deterrence through signals of relationships with or by friends, family, colleagues, etc.) 39.0%

ENGAGE INDEPENDENT/PRIVATE ASSISTANCE
(e.g., private investigator, bodyguard, protection service, etc.) 10.2%

ENGAGE LEGAL/LAW ENFORCEMENT INPUT
(e.g., seek or obtain input from victims advocate, report to public attorney, police, domestic violence unit, social worker, etc.) 5.1%

MOVING AWAY:

IGNORE THE PERSON'S BEHAVIOR
(e.g., avoid eye contact, non-responsive to pursuer's talk & behaviors) 88.0%
USE VERBAL "ESCAPE" TACTICS
(e.g., make excuses, claim prior commitments, existing relationship, role restrictions, etc.) 67.8%

DISTANCE YOURSELF
(e.g., maintain or increase physical distance, lean away during conversation, walk away, etc.) 66.1%

ATTEMPT TO END THE RELATIONSHIP
(e.g., claim relationship is over, provide relationship ultimatum or define boundaries, etc.) 63.2%

CONTROL THE INTERACTION
(e.g., avoid asking questions, use closed body orientation, stand/sit closer with others during conversation, etc.) 62.7%

DETACH OR DEPERSONALIZE
(e.g., act impersonal, unemotional, uninvolved, avoid jokes or intimate communication, behave ritualistically, act strictly polite, etc.) 58.6%

BEHAVE CAUTIOUSLY
(e.g., make plans of action and escape, become more aware of environment, become more conservative or careful in daily routine, etc.) 50.8%

REDIRECT OR DIVERT ATTENTION OF PURSUER
(e.g., get pursuer interested in other activities, hobbies, or another person with whom she or he might be more compatible, etc.) 49.2%

RESTRICT YOUR ACCESSIBILITY
(e.g., change schedule, arrive or leave earlier, shift activities to more public venues, etc.) 47.5%

BLOCK YOUR ELECTRONIC OR MEDIA ACCESSIBILITY
(e.g., get caller ID, change e-mail address, contact ISP or internet provider to block certain contact sources, etc.) 28.8%

BLOCK YOUR PHYSICAL ACCESSIBILITY
(e.g., arrange environment to avoid contact: close office doors, harden home security, caller ID, *69, hang up when called, change locks, etc.) 18.6%

RELOCATE
(e.g., change jobs, change address, change classes, change hobby/recreational locations, etc.) 14.3%

MOVING AGAINST:
ISSUE VERBAL WARNINGS/THREATS
(e.g., articulate punishments or sanctions that the pursuer will experience if pursuit continues, threaten the police, violence, etc.) 17.2%

BUILD A LEGAL CASE
(e.g., save voice mail/e-mail, save gifts/notes, keep log of phone calls, etc.) 13.8%

USE ELECTRONIC PROTECTIVE RESPONSES
(e.g., contact on-line service to block or investigate e-mail access, enhance firewalls in computer, sabotaging pursuer's website, etc.) 6.9%

PURSUE A LEGAL CASE
(e.g., sue, swear out a complaint, hire a lawyer, pursue indictment on harassment or stalking laws, etc.) 5.2%

USE PHYSICAL VIOLENCE
(e.g., hit, shove, use a weapon, throw an object, blackmail, restrain, beat up, etc.) 3.4%
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MOVING TOWARD OR WITH:

DIMINISH THE SERIOUSNESS OF THE SITUATION
(e.g., tease or joke with the pursuer, make light of the pursuer’s actions, etc.) 36.2%

NEGOTIATE RELATIONSHIP DEFINITION
(i.e., discuss pursuer’s own preferred relationship objectives to arrive at a mutual definition; e.g., just be friends, just be colleagues, reconciliation of previous relationship, etc.) 27.6%

USE PROBLEM SOLVING NEGOTIATION
(i.e., confront pursuer with responsibility for actions and alternative approaches to achieve objectives, etc.) 22.4%

BARGAIN
(e.g., offer compromises, promises, or other rewards to get pursuer to alter behavior, etc.) 22.4%

USE NONVERBAL AGGRESSION
(e.g., yell at, criticize, insult, make fun of, show anger, annoyance, frustration, use harsh or hostile voice, write a strongly worded e-mail, etc.) 20.7%

DECIEVE THEM
(e.g., flirt or hint at interest to get out of immediate situation, arrange or suggest future meetings with no intent to keep date, etc.) 20.7%

ATTEMPT TO DETER FUTURE BEHAVIOR
(e.g., carry air horn or mace, show weapon, get self-defense training, put security stickers on car and home windows, etc.) 19.0%

ACCEPT PROMISES
(e.g., believe or hope that discussions that pursuer will behave more appropriately will work, etc.) 17.2%

USE PROTECTIVE RESPONSES TO CURRENT BEHAVIOR
(e.g., call police, seek restraining order, press charges, sue, etc.) 13.8%

USING ELECTRONIC RETALIATORY RESPONSES
(e.g., sabotaging pursuer’s website, “spamming” pursuer’s e-mail, sending viruses to pursuer’s e-mail, etc.) 8.6%

A majority of those responding to unwanted pursuit appeared to rely on moving inward (e.g., ignoring the problem, seeking therapy, minimizing the perceived problem, etc.), moving outward (e.g., engaging social support, seeking sympathy from others, etc.), and moving away (e.g., ignoring the person’s behavior interactionally, using verbal escape tactics, distancing oneself, etc.). Far less prevalent were attempts to move against (e.g., issue verbal warnings or threats, pursue legal retribution, etc.) or moving toward / with (e.g., negotiate relationship definition, make humor or light of the situation, etc.). Although a majority of those engaging in coping activity selected moving inward, outward and away, when the means of these strategies are examined, it is obvious that among the 58 to 60 respondents using coping responses, none of these strategies were used extensively: inward (M = 1.07, sd = .65, range = 0-2.75), outward (M = 0.80, sd = .85, range = 0-3.00), away (M = 3.25, sd = .87, range = 0-2.71), toward (M = 0.49, sd = .71, range = 0-2.71), and against (M = 0.23, sd = .42, range = 0-1.75). It appears that those who experienced unwanted pursuit use a broad range of coping responses, but do not rely on any of them extensively. The fact that unwanted pursuit averaged over 8
months in duration suggests that when tactics fail the first time, they are not repeated. This may account for the variety of tactics employed — when one type of response fails, the object of pursuit tries another type of tactic.

With such a pervasive social problem, one that seems to be anything but a "one time" thing (again, "the caller rarely calls once!"), much more work needs to be done, in both Anglo and non-Anglo populations (the focus of this work). Given this, some thoughts about this study regarding coping with unwanted relational pursuit and stalking in Japan, as well as ideas for future research, deserve mention. One limitation to this research was having the vast majority of subjects in this sample come from a university population. Future work must address adults of all ages in order to get a better overview of unwanted relational pursuit across varying stages of life. This would entail seeking out people of all areas in society. Furthermore, future work should delve more into not only the coping mechanisms used, but also the causes (real or perceived) of unwanted pursuit on the part of the victims, including the symptoms of the people who fall victim. If we know what causes someone to be victimized (or hesitate to recognize and report stalking and pursuit behaviors), that could lead to attempts to stop it before it becomes dangerous to the victim (emotionally, physically and/or financially). To get a bigger grasp of the overall problem in Japan, a future study would ask subjects to take part in more measures (stalking experience, symptoms of victims, and coping) so researchers and counselors can learn more about what type of person falls prey to stalking and how (or even if) they cope with it.

Mentioned earlier, this paper lacked an adequate number of Japanese subjects who have experience coping with unwanted relational pursuit, but it is a step in the right direction for understanding one non-Anglo population. Learning how Japanese people cope is the first step toward achieving appropriate help for the victims of unwanted pursuit. The typology of coping responses used here will, hopefully, lead to (a) better assessment of the behavior of the victims and whether or not there is any connection to an increase or decrease of stalking behavior; and (b) it may produce more thorough and detailed advice as well as intervention tactics to benefit victims (Spitzberg, 2002). Furthermore, with respect to professionally treating victims of unwanted relational intrusion, the recent development of the typology of coping tactics used in this research will hopefully increase the option for guidance to counselors and victim's groups in terms of offering advise to the victims about possible options they may take (legal, or otherwise). Spitzberg (2002) adds that after such typologies are developed, making new and thorough assessment instruments to provide categories, items and concepts from multiple resources is more easily attained. Those new instruments, when used to compare studies of similar content may provide "sounder clinical and law enforcement interventions" (Spitzberg, 2002, p. 277).

Note: The authors extend gratitude to the following scholars whose laborious efforts to translate the English version of the measures into Japanese made this study possible: Seiki Katakura (M.D., Hiroshima University Hospital); Yoshiyuki Notohara (Lecturer at Hijiyama University, Hiroshima); Jun Sasaki (Assoc. Professor at Hijiyama University, Hiroshima); Tatsuya Shinagawa (Professor at Hijiyama Junior College, Hiroshima) and Chiaki Yamada (Lecturer at Hijiyama University, Hiroshima).
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Appendix A: Japanese Language Questionnaire

みんな異性と親しくなったりしたいものです。ただ友達になりたい時もあれば、付き合いたい時もあるでしょう。しかし、本人がそうしたいと思っても、相手はそうではないかもしれません。親しくなりたいと思うとき、人は普段しないことをやろうとします。
（例えば、他人のプライバシーにまで入っていったり、手紙やメールを出したりします。あるいは、脅すようなことを言ったりして親しくならなうとすることがあるかもしれません。）

このアンケートは、もしあなたが過去に異性から何らかのアプローチがあった場合どのようにしてアプローチをされたかを尋ねるもののです。このアンケートは匿名で答えていただきますので、外部に漏れるようなことは一切ありません。もし答えたくないなければ答える必要はありませんので、その場合は担当教官にアンケートを渡してください。

1〜28番まではあなた自身についてです。42〜47番も答えてください。
もし1〜28番の質問の中にあるようなことを実際経験しているなら、29〜41番の質問に答えてください。また、5〜7ページの1〜40番の質問にも答えてください。

ご協力ありがとうございました。

これまで誰かが故意にあなたに行った行為（1〜28の事項）……によって悩まされたことがありますか？

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>当てはまるものに〇をつけてください</th>
<th>一度もない</th>
<th>1回</th>
<th>2〜3回</th>
<th>4〜5回</th>
<th>5回以上</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 欲しくないプレゼント
（例えば、花、ぬいぐるみ、写真、貴金属などを渡された）
0 1 2 3 4

2. 手紙（例えばラグレター、メッセージカード、ヴォイスメール、Eメールなどを渡された）
0 1 2 3 4

3. 過剰な愛情表現のある手紙
（例えば何度も「好きだ」と書かれている手紙を渡された）
0 1 2 3 4

4. つけまわされた
（例えば仕事場、学校、自宅などからつけられる）
0 1 2 3 4

5. ずっと見られていた
（例えば自宅の近くを車で通って見ていたり、遠くのほうから見ていたり、じっと見られていたりした）
0 1 2 3 4
6. 無理やり会話しようとされた。あるいは会話に入り込もうとした
（例えば、あなたが他の人と話しているにもかかわらず、ずっとそばにいて
会話を聞いていたり、頼めないのにアドバイスをされたり、
あなたが忙しいのがわかっているのに無理やり話そうとされた） 0 1 2 3 4

7. あなたに近づいてきた（例えば話している最中に異常に
接近してきたり、触れてきたりした） 0 1 2 3 4

8. 無理やり何かの活動（クラブやサークルなど）に入れようとした
（例えば何かのプログラムに登録させようとした、メーリングリストに
参加させようとしても、紹介目的で勝手にあなたの名前を使われた） 0 1 2 3 4

9. 自分のテリトリーを侵害された
（例えばあなたの持ち物を勝手に使われたり、自宅に勝手に入られたり、
自宅の玄関にいたりされたことがある）。 0 1 2 3 4

10. あなたの友人、家族、同僚に介入することによって
（例えばあなたの友人、家族、同僚に力を貸そうとして、社会的行
事に招いてくれと頼ってくれとせがんだりして） 0 1 2 3 4

11. あなたの行動を監視することによって
（例えばあなたの行き先をチェックするため四六時中電話したり、
友人を通じてあなたのことを調べたりして） 0 1 2 3 4

12. 公共の場所であなたに近づいたり驚かせることによって
（例えばお店、職場、ジムなどに現れたり、角で待ち伏せたりして） 0 1 2 3 4

13. 個人情報をこっそり入手することによって
（例えばあなたの留守電を開いたり承諾なしに写真を撮ったり
郵便やE-mailを盗み見したりして） 0 1 2 3 4

14. あなたの財産を侵すことによって
（例えばあなたの家、車、バックパック、ブリーフケースなどに入ったり壊したりして） 0 1 2 3 4

15. 膨張メッセージを送ることによって
（例えばいたずら電話、中傷と思われるメモ、カード、手紙、E-mailなどで） 0 1 2 3 4

16. 物理的にあなたを拘束することによって
（例えば脅をつかんだり、行く手を阻んだり、
車の中に入り時ドアを抑えたりして） 0 1 2 3 4
17. 恒常的に嫌がらせをすることによって
（例えば公に苦情を提出したり，上見等に偽の噂を流したり，
差し止め手続きをしたりして） 0 1 2 3 4

18. 貴重品を盗んだり怪つけたりして
（例えば資産が故意に壊されたり，当人のみが触れうる大切な贈り物，
ペットなどが傷つけられたりして） 0 1 2 3 4

19. 彼または彼女を脅すことによって
（例えば悪いことが起こるとそれとなく脅したり，
自殺を勧めさせたりして） 0 1 2 3 4

20. 好意を寄せる存在を脅すことによって
（例えば恋人や友達，ペットを用いて脅迫したり，
警告をほのめかす） 0 1 2 3 4

21. 言葉によって脅迫することによって
（例えば何か悪いことが起こるとか，個人攻撃をしてやるなど
脅迫されること） 0 1 2 3 4

22. 脅威となるものを送られることによって
（例えば知らないところで撮られた自分の写真とか
ポルノグラフィなど） 0 1 2 3 4

23. 脅威を与えるような方法を用いて様々な場所に現れることによって
（例えば教室や職場に突然現れたり，
家に侵入していったり待ち伏せていたりすること） 0 1 2 3 4

24. 性的強要することによって
（例えば無理やりキスをしたり体を触られたり，
露出した体を見せつけられたりすること） 0 1 2 3 4

25. 物理的方法によって脅すことによって
（例えば物を投げられたり，殴るふりをしたりすること） 0 1 2 3 4

26. 肉体を傷つけられたりすることによって
（例えば強く押し飛ばされたり殴られたりすること） 0 1 2 3 4

27. 誘拐や身体を拘束されることによって
（例えば車や家の中に閉じ込められたり，縛られたりする） 0 1 2 3 4
28. 命の危険に晒されることによって
（例えば道路に突き落とされたり，凶器を突きつけて
服従させられたりする）

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

以下の質問は，あなたが今までに，何らかのストーカー行為を受けた経験があるかどうかを問うものです。該当しない項目は飛ばして次の項目へ進んで下さい。

29. これまでの28項目の問いに対する答えに，どれか一つでも 0 〜 4 があった場合，この質問に答え
て下さい。あなたに最もしつこく付きまとまった人物の性別を教えて下さい。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>性別</th>
<th>男性</th>
<th>女性</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

30. 今までに後を付けられた，あるいは嫌がらせを受けた，あるいは，しつこく付きまとまれた経験
がある。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>回答</th>
<th>はい</th>
<th>いいえ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

31. 30番の答えが「はい」の場合，この質問に答えて下さい。
その行為によって恐怖感を覚えた，あるいは自分自身や家族の身の危険を感じた，あるいは所有
物の安全確保への不安を生じたりした。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>回答</th>
<th>はい</th>
<th>いいえ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

32. 30番の答えが「はい」の場合，この質問に答えて下さい。
その行為はどれくらいの期間続きましたか。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>年</th>
<th>個月</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

33. 30番の答えが「はい」の場合，この質問に答えて下さい。
あなたはその行為を「ストーカー行為」であると考えますか。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>回答</th>
<th>はい</th>
<th>いいえ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

34. 33番の答えが「はい」の場合，この質問に答えて下さい。
ひと月におおよそ何回，その人物からストーカー行為を受けましたか？

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>回</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

35. 33番の答えが「はい」の場合，この質問に答えて下さい。
今まで，何人の人物からストーカー行為を受けましたか？

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>人</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

36. 33番の答えが「はい」の場合，この質問に答えて下さい。
あなたに付きまとまった，あるいは「ストーカー行為」人物の性別を教えて下さい。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>性別</th>
<th>男性</th>
<th>女性</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

37. 33番の答えが「はい」の場合，この質問に答えて下さい。
この人物は，あなた以外の他の誰かにストーカー行為を行ったことがあると考えられますか。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>回答</th>
<th>はい</th>
<th>いいえ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

38. 33番の答えが「はい」の場合、この質問に答えて下さい。
ストーカー行為が始まる以前、あなたとその人物とはどのような関係でしたか。
  他人
  隣人
  同僚
  友人
  家族・身内
  友達以上恋人未満
  恋人
  配偶者
  元配偶者・不仲、別居中の配偶者
  その他（詳しく）

39. 33番の答えが「はい」の場合、この質問に答えて下さい。
現在ストーカー行為が停止している場合、なぜその人物がストーカー行為を止めたのか、思い当たる理由があれば簡単に記入して下さい。

---

40. 38番の関係は、ストーカー行為が始まる以前、どのくらい続いていましたか。

   ____年____ヶ月

41. 38番の関係は、どのくらい前に始まりましたか。

   ____年____ヶ月

42. あなたは今まで、ストーカー行為と考えら得るほど、
    情熱的に誰かを追い求めたことがありますか。

   はい     いいえ

43. あなたの性別を教えて下さい。

   男性     女性

44. あなたの年齢は？

   ---------

45. あなたの最終学歴は？(○をつけてください)：
   中学校     高校     短期大学
   大学       大学院     博士     その他：_______

46. あなたのの職業は（○をつけてください）：
   学生       アルバイト     会社員     自営業
   家事手伝い     無職     その他：__________

47. あなたの年収は（○をつけてください）：
   100万円以下     100万円-200万円     200万円-300万円
   300万円-400万円     400万円-500万円     500万円-750万円
   750万円以上
これまで誰かに付きまとわれたことがある人は、以下の質問に答えてください。
質問の中には該当するものがないかもしれませんが、各質問に対して、解答欄の適当だと思う数字に〇をつけてください。もし、付きまとわれたことがない人は、最後のページに行してください。しつこく付きまとわれた時、当てはまるものに〇をつけてください。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>当てはまるものに〇をつけてください</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>一度もなかった</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 無視しましたか？
（そのうち時間がたてば、相手もやめそうだと思って）
2. まったく問題ではないと考えた。
（自分が思うほど深刻にはならないだろうと考えた）
3. つきまとわれている事自体を否定しようとした。
（付きまといはされていないと考えた）
4. 自分自身に非があると考えた。
（自分自身の軽率な行動が引き起こしたと考えた）
5. 何かいい解決策はないかと考えた。
（趣味に没頭したり、運動したり、マッサージをしたり、
テレビやインターネットをしたりして、気をまぎらそうとした）
6. なぜ付きまとわれているのかを考えた。
（自分自身が置かれている状況の分析を行ったり、
なぜこうなってしまったかを考えた）
7. 宗教や、文学書、哲学書などを読んで、解決しようとした。
8. 現実逃避をした。
（ドラッグをしたり、お酒を飲んだり、自殺を図ろうとした）
9. 誰かに打ち明けて、分かってもらえるとした。
（個人的な問題を泣きながら打ち明けた）
10. 誰かに相談にのってもらった。
（友達や家族、カウンセラーに相談にのってもらった）
11. 誰かに相談して直接解決してもらうとした。
（友達、家族、同僚などに直接相手に言ってもらった）
12. 何か法的措置をとった。
（弁護士、警察、DV相談所、ソーシャルワーカーに相談した）0 1 2 3 4

13. 個人の的な助けを求めた。
（探偵、ボディーガードなどを雇った）0 1 2 3 4

14. 慎重に行動した。
（周りにもっと注意したり、出歩かないようにしたりした）0 1 2 3 4

15. 相手のことを無視した。
（目を合わせないようにしたり、話さないようにした）0 1 2 3 4

16. 自分で何か策を講じた。
（話しかけないようにしたり、誰かほかの人と一緒にいるようにした）0 1 2 3 4

17. （物理的に）距離を置くようにした。
（会話するときには一定の距離を保つようにしたりした）0 1 2 3 4

18. （精神的に）距離を置くようにした。
（会話するときは事務的にするようにした）0 1 2 3 4

19. 注意をそらした。
（相手の注意を趣味や他の人に向けさせた）0 1 2 3 4

20. 逃げる口実を使った。（約束があるなど）0 1 2 3 4

21. 自分のスケジュールを変えるなどした。
（普段より早く家を出たり、帰ったりした）0 1 2 3 4

22. 周りの環境を変えた。
（家のセキュリティーを強化したり、ロックを変えたりした）0 1 2 3 4

23. Eメールアドレスを変えたり、番号通知サービスを利用した。0 1 2 3 4

24. 仕事を変えたり、引っ越ししたり、遊ぶ場所を変えたりした。0 1 2 3 4

25. 関係を切ろうとした。
（関係を終わらせると相手に告げたりした）0 1 2 3 4

26. 事態の深刻さを軽減する
（からかったり、冗談を言ったり、軽視したりして）0 1 2 3 4
27. 欺く
（軽く扱ったり、当面の事態から降りるとほのめかしたり、
守るつもりのない約束を偽わしたりして）
0 1 2 3 4

28. 問題解決の駆け引きをする
（目的達成のための行動やそれに代わる取り組みに向けて断固対決して）
0 1 2 3 4

29. 相手との関係を定義するために交渉する
（すなわち相手の求めている関係について相互に合意できるよう
話し合う。単なる友人か、仲間か、以前の関係へ戻るのか）
0 1 2 3 4

30. 交渉する
（妥協を提案する、約束する、相手の態度を変えさせるための対価を支払う）
0 1 2 3 4

31. 約束を受け入れる
（相手に通じる送信状態に振舞うという話し合いが、
うまく行くと信じた頼りをする）
0 1 2 3 4

32. 今後このような振る舞いをやめさせようとする
（警備員や相手を拾う行い、凶器を見せる、護身術の訓練を受ける、
車や家内の壁に防護ステッカーを貼る）
0 1 2 3 4

33. 電子的報復措置をとる
（ウェブサイトを破壊する、迷惑メールを送る、
Eメールにウイルスを送る）
0 1 2 3 4

34. 非言語の攻撃手段を用いる
（叫ぶ、批評する、侮辱する、からかう、怒る、困らせ、
いらいらさせる、敵意のある声を出す、きつねEメールを出す）
0 1 2 3 4

35. 現在の行為に対して自分を守る対応をする
（警察に通報する、差し止めを求める、告発する、訴える）
0 1 2 3 4

36. 電子的保護措置をとる
（Eメールへのアクセスを阻止、調査のためオンラインサービスを利用する、不法アクセス防止の質を高める、ウェブサイトを破壊する）
0 1 2 3 4

37. 口頭で警告を発する
（追っかけが続くなら相手は罰則・裁量を受ける旨を
明確に表明する、警察に訴えると脅す、暴力に訴える）
0 1 2 3 4
38. 暴力を振るう
（たたく，突く，凶器を使う，物を投げる，
脅迫する，拘束する，リンチする） 0 1 2 3 4

39. 訴訟の理論構築をする
（音声メール・Eメールを残しておく，贈り物・
メモを残しておく，通話記録をとっておく，わなをかける） 0 1 2 3 4

40. 訴訟をする
（訴える，告訴が正しいと宣誓する，
弁護士を雇う，迷惑・ストーカー防止法で告訴する） 0 1 2 3 4
Appendix B: English Language Questionnaire

OBSESSIVE RELATIONAL INTRUSION

(© Spitzberg & Cupach, 1997)

People often pursue intimate relationships without realizing that the person being pursued does not want such a relationship. These pursuers may want friendship, or romantic intimacy, or perhaps just recognition. In addition, they often do things that do not appear in normal circumstances to be intimate, such as invading your privacy, intruding into your life, and/or making threats (e.g., "if you don’t go out with me, I’ll kill myself"), or refusing to let go. We are interested in finding out if you have ever experienced such a “relationship,” and what kinds of actions this pursuer displayed.

In your lifetime, how often, if at all, has anyone ever obsessively pursued you over a period of time for the purpose of establishing an intimate relationship that you did NOT want? That is, ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circle the best Answer</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
<th>ONCE TIME</th>
<th>TIMES</th>
<th>TIMES</th>
<th>TIMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has anyone ever undesirably &amp; obsessively pursued you by...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. LEAVING UNWANTED GIFTS (e.g., flowers, stuffed animals, photographs, jewelry, etc.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has anyone ever undesirably &amp; obsessively pursued you by...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LEAVING UNWANTED MESSAGES OF AFFECTION (e.g., romantically-oriented notes, cards, letters, voice-mail, E-mail, messages with friends, etc.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has anyone ever undesirably &amp; obsessively pursued you by...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MAKING EXAGGERATED EXPRESSIONS OF AFFECTION (e.g., saying &quot;I love you&quot; after limited interaction, doing large and unsolicited favors for you, etc.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has anyone ever undesirably &amp; obsessively pursued you by...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FOLLOWING YOU AROUND (e.g., following you to or from work, school, home, gym, daily activities, etc.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has anyone ever undesirably &amp; obsessively pursued you by...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. WATCHING YOU (e.g., driving by home or work, watching you from a distance, gazing at you in public places, etc.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Has anyone ever undesirably & obsessively pursued you by...

6. INTRUDING UNINVITED INTO YOUR INTERACTIONS 0 1 2 3 4
   (e.g., "hovers" around your conversations, offers unsolicited
   advice, initiates conversations when you are clearly busy, etc.)

Has anyone ever undesirably & obsessively pursued you by...

7. INVADING YOUR PERSONAL SPACE 0 1 2 3 4
   (e.g., getting too close to you in conversation,
   touching you, etc.)

Has anyone ever undesirably & obsessively pursued you by...

8. INVOLVING YOU IN ACTIVITIES IN UNWANTED WAYS 0 1 2 3 4
   (e.g., enrolling you in programs, putting you on
   mailing lists, using your name as a reference, etc.)

Has anyone ever undesirably & obsessively pursued you by...

9. INVADING YOUR PERSONAL PROPERTY 0 1 2 3 4
   (e.g., handling your possessions, breaking and entering
   into your home, showing up at your door or car, etc.)

Has anyone ever undesirably & obsessively pursued you by...

10. INTRUDING UPON YOUR FRIENDS, FAMILY OR COWORKERS 0 1 2 3 4
    (e.g., trying to befriend your friends, family or coworkers; seeking to
    be invited to social events, seeking employment at your work, etc.)

Has anyone ever undesirably & obsessively pursued you by...

11. MONITORING YOU AND/OR YOUR BEHAVIOR 0 1 2 3 4
    (e.g., calling at all hours to check on your whereabouts,
    checking up on you through mutual friends, etc.)

Has anyone ever undesirably & obsessively pursued you by...

12. APPROACHING OR SURPRISING YOU IN PUBLIC PLACES 0 1 2 3 4
    (e.g., showing up at places such as stores, work, gym;
    lying in wait around corners, etc.)

Has anyone ever undesirably & obsessively pursued you by...

13. COVERTLY OBTAINING PRIVATE INFORMATION 0 1 2 3 4
    (e.g., listening to your message machine, taking photos of you
    without your knowledge, stealing your mail or e-mail, etc.)
Has anyone ever undesirably & obsessively pursued you by...

14. INVADING YOUR PROPERTY
   (e.g., breaking and entering your home, car, desk, backpack or briefcase, etc.)

15. LEAVING UNWANTED THREATENING MESSAGES
   (e.g., hang-up calls; notes, cards, letters, voice-mail, e-mail, messages with friends, implying harm or potential harm, etc.)

16. PHYSICALLY RESTRAINING YOU
   (e.g., grabbing your arm, blocking your progress, holding your car door while you’re in the car, etc.)

17. ENGAGING IN REGULATORY HARASSMENT
   (e.g., filing official complaints, spreading false rumors to officials--boss, instructor, etc., obtaining a restraining order on you, etc.)

18. STEALING OR DAMAGING VALUED POSSESSIONS
   (e.g., you found property vandalized; things missing, damaged or hurt that only this person had access to, such as prior gifts, pets, etc.)

19. THREATENING TO HURT HIM- OR HERSELF
   (e.g., vague threats that something bad will happen to him- or herself, threatening to commit suicide, etc.)

20. THREATENING OTHERS YOU CARE ABOUT
   (e.g., threatening harm to or making vague warnings about romantic partners, friends, family, pets, etc.)

21. VERBALLY THREATENING YOU PERSONALLY
   (e.g., threats or vague warnings that something bad will happen to you, threatening personally to hurt you, etc.)
Has anyone ever undesirably & obsessively pursued you by...

22. LEAVING OR SENDING YOU THREATENING OBJECTS  
(e.g., marked up photographs, photographs taken of you without your knowledge, pornography, weapons, etc.)

23. SHOWING UP AT PLACES IN THREATENING WAYS  
(e.g., showing up at class, office or work, from behind a corner, staring from across a street, being inside your home, etc.)

24. SEXUALLY COERCING YOU  
(e.g., forcefully attempted/succeeded in kissing, feeling, or disrobing you, exposed him/herself, forced sexual behavior, etc.)

25. PHYSICALLY THREATENING YOU  
(e.g., throwing something at you, acting as if s/he will hit you, running finger across neck implying throat slitting, etc.)

26. PHYSICALLY HURTING YOU  
(e.g., pushing or shoving you, slapping you, hitting you with fist, hitting you with an object, etc.)

27. KIDNAPPING OR PHYSICALLY CONSTRAINING YOU  
(e.g., by force or threat of force, trapped you in a car or room; bound you; took you places against your will; etc.)

28. PHYSICALLY ENDANGERING YOUR LIFE  
(e.g., trying to run you off the road, displaying a weapon in front of you, using a weapon to subdue you, etc.)

PLEASE CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE
The next items ask you to indicate whether you have experienced a certain type of relationship pursuit at some point in your life. If at any point your answer is "NO," or the item does not apply to you, skip to the next item of the survey.

29. If you answered any of the previous 28 items with anything other than "0," what is the sex of the person who was your most persistent unwanted pursuer? ___ MALE ___ FEMALE

30. "During some period of my life I have experienced being followed and/or harassed and/or obsessively pursued by someone." ___ YES ___ NO

31. If "yes" to #30, did it occur in a manner that you personally felt was threatening, or placed you in fear of your own safety, or the safety and security of your family, friends, or possessions ... ___ YES ___ NO

32. If "yes" to #30, approximately how long did it occur, in ... ___ Years ___ Months

33. If "yes" to #30, would you consider what you experienced as a form of "stalking." That is, have you ever been "stalked"? ___ YES ___ NO

34. If "yes" to #33, on average how many times a month did this person do something to stalk you? ___ Number?

35. If "yes" to #33, how many different people have you been stalked by? ___ Number?

36. If "yes" to #33, what was the sex of the person pursuing you? ___ MALE ___ FEMALE

37. If "yes" to #33, do you have reason to believe that this person has stalked others before or after you? ___ YES ___ NO

38. If "yes" to #33, what type of relationship did you have, if any, prior to the time that the pursuit became unwanted?
___ STRANGER
___ ACQUAINTANCE
___ COLLEAGUE, OR SERVICE RELATIONSHIP
___ FRIENDSHIP
___ FAMILY MEMBER OR RELATIVE
___ "CASUALLY DATING" RELATIONSHIP
___ "SERIOUSLY DATING" RELATIONSHIP
___ SPOUSE
___ EX-SPOUSE, ESTRANGED OR SEPARATED SPOUSE
___ OTHER (Please specify: _________________________)
39. If "yes" to #33, and if it has since stopped, why do you think the Person ultimately stopped stalking or pursuing you? Explain briefly:

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

40. How long did the relationship in #38 last before the person's pursuit became unwanted? __ Years __ Months

41. How long ago did the relationship in #38 begin? __ Years __ Months

42. Do you believe that YOU have ever engaged in romantic pursuit in ways that a reasonable person might consider to be stalking? __ YES __ NO

43. What is your sex?

____ MALE ____ FEMALE

Coping

(Spitzberg & Brundidge, 2001 ©)

If you have ever in your adult life experienced someone who has obsessively intruded upon, pursued, harassed, or stalked in unwanted way, please respond to the items below. The items represent several types of responses that you may or may not have used in an effort to cope with this unwanted pursuit. For each behavior, please indicate the extent to which you used it, if at all, according to the response scale provided. Please circle only one answer per item. If you have not been obsessively pursued, please skip to the last page.

Circle the best Answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCAS-</th>
<th>VERY</th>
<th>CONST-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>IONALLY</td>
<td>OFTEN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOVING INWARD:

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever...

1. IGNORE THE PROBLEM
   (e.g., wait, assume problem will go away on its own, etc.)
   0 1 2 3 4

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever...

2. MINIMIZE THE PROBLEM IN YOUR OWN MIND
   (e.g., rationalize that the problem is less significant or serious than it actually is, etc.)
   0 1 2 3 4
While this person was pursuing you, did you ever . . .

3. DENY THE PROBLEM
   (e.g., refuse to acknowledge the problem at all; rationalize alternative explanations for experiences, etc.)

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever . . .

4. BLAME YOURSELF
   (e.g., attribute responsibility for problems to self actions or perceptions, etc.)

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever . . .

5. SEEK THERAPIES
   (e.g., invest time and effort into hobbies, drugs, exercise, medicine, therapeutic activities such as massage, meditation, exercise, watch television, internet, etc.)

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever . . .

6. SEEK MEANING IN GENERAL
   (e.g., invest time and effort into Making sense of your situation, trying to find a reason, etc.)

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever . . .

7. SEEK MEANING IN CONTEXT
   (e.g., invest time and effort into religion, philosophy, education, literature, etc.)

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever . . .

8. ENGAGE IN SELF-DESTRUCTIVE ESCAPISM
   (e.g., using drugs or alcohol, doing addictive things, attempting suicide, etc.)

MOVING OUTWARD:

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever . . .

9. SEEK SYMPATHY FROM OTHERS
   (e.g., cry, explain personal problems caused by the pursuer, etc.)

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever . . .

10. ENGAGE SOCIAL SUPPORT
    (e.g., seek or obtain emotional and/or instrumental support from friends, family, counselor, etc.)
While this person was pursuing you, did you ever... 

11. ENGAGE DIRECT INVOLVEMENT OF OTHERS  
(e.g., seek or obtain protection or deterrence through signals of relationships with or by friends, family, colleagues, etc.)

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever... 

12. ENGAGE LEGAL/LAW ENFORCEMENT INPUT  
(e.g., seek or obtain input from victims advocate, report to public attorney, police, domestic violence unit, social worker, etc.)

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever... 

13. ENGAGE INDEPENDENT/PRIVATE ASSISTANCE  
(e.g., private investigator, bodyguard, protection service, etc.)

MOVING AWAY: 

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever... 

14. BEHAVE CAUTIOUSLY  
(e.g., make plans of action and escape, become more aware of environment, become more conservative or careful in daily routine, etc.)

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever... 

15. IGNORE THE PERSON'S BEHAVIOR  
(e.g., avoid eye contact, be non-responsive to pursuer's talk and behaviors)

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever... 

16. CONTROL THE INTERACTION  
(e.g., avoid asking questions, use closed body orientation, stand/sit closer with others during conversation, etc.)

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever... 

17. DISTANCE YOURSELF  
(e.g., maintain or increase physical distance, lean away during conversation, walk away, etc.)

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever... 

18. DETATCH OR DEPERSONALIZE  
(e.g., act impersonal, unemotional, uninvolved, avoid jokes or intimate communication, behave ritualistically, act strictly polite, etc.)
While this person was pursuing you, did you ever . . .

19. REDIRECT OR DIVERT ATTENTION OF PURSUER 0 1 2 3 4
   (e.g., get pursuer interested in other activities, hobbies,
or another person with whom she or he might be more compatible, etc.)

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever . . .

20. USE VERBAL "ESCAPE" TACTICS 0 1 2 3 4
   (e.g., make excuses, claim prior commitments,existing relationship, role restrictions, etc.)

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever . . .

21. RESTRICT YOUR ACCESSABILITY 0 1 2 3 4
   (e.g., change schedule, arrive or leave earlier,shift activities to more public venues, etc.)

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever . . .

22. BLOCK YOUR PHYSICAL ACCESSABILITY 0 1 2 3 4
   (e.g., arrange environment to avoid contact: close office doors,harden home security, caller ID, *69, hang up when called, change locks, etc.)

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever . . .

23. BLOCK YOUR ELECTRONIC OR MEDIA ACCESSABILITY 0 1 2 3 4
   (e.g., get caller ID, *69, change e-mail address, contact ISP or internet provider to block certain contact sources, etc.)

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever . . .

24. RELOCATE 0 1 2 3 4
   (e.g., change jobs, change address, change classes,change hobby/recreational locations, etc.)

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever . . .

25. ATTEMPT TO END THE RELATIONSHIP 0 1 2 3 4
   (e.g., claim relationship is over, provide relationship ultimatum or define boundaries, etc.)

MOVING TOWARD/WITH:

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever . . .

26. DIMINISH THE SERIOUSNESS OF THE SITUATION 0 1 2 3 4
   (e.g., tease or joke with the pursuer, make light of the pursuer's actions, etc.)
While this person was pursuing you, did you ever...  
27. DECIEVE THEM  
0 1 2 3 4  
(e.g., flirt or hint at interest to get out of immediate situation,  
arrange or suggest future meetings with no intent to keep date, etc.)

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever...  
28. USE PROBLEM SOLVING NEGOTIATION  
0 1 2 3 4  
(i.e., confront pursuer with responsibility for actions and  
alternative approaches to achieve objectives, etc.)

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever...  
29. NEGOTIATE RELATIONSHIP DEFINITION  
0 1 2 3 4  
(i.e., discuss pursuer’s own preferred relationship objectives to arrive at  
a mutual definition; e.g., just be friends, just be colleagues, reconciliation  
of previous relationship, etc.)

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever...  
30. BARGAIN  
0 1 2 3 4  
(e.g., offer compromises, promises, or other rewards  
to get pursuer to alter behavior, etc.)

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever...  
31. ACCEPT PROMISES  
0 1 2 3 4  
(e.g., believe or hope that discussions that pursuer  
will behave more appropriately will work, etc.)

MOVING AGAINST:  
While this person was pursuing you, did you ever...  
32. ATTEMPT TO DETER FUTURE BEHAVIOR  
0 1 2 3 4  
(e.g., carry an air horn or mace, show a weapon, get self-defense training,  
put security stickers on your car and home windows, etc.)

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever...  
33. USING ELECTRONIC RETALIATORY RESPONSES  
0 1 2 3 4  
(e.g., sabotaging pursuer’s website, “spamming” pursuer’s  
e-mail, sending viruses to pursuer’s e-mail, etc.)

While this person was pursuing you, did you ever...  
34. USE NONVERBAL AGGRESSION  
0 1 2 3 4  
(e.g., yell at, criticize, insult, make fun of, show anger, annoyance,  
frustration, use harsh or hostile voice, write a strongly worded e-mail, etc.)
While this person was pursuing you, did you ever...

35. USE PROTECTIVE RESPONSES TO CURRENT BEHAVIOR
   (e.g., call police, seek restraining order, press charges, sue, etc.)
   0  1  2  3  4

36. USE ELECTRONIC PROTECTIVE RESPONSES
   (e.g., contact on-line service to block or investigate e-mail access,
   enhance firewalls in computer, sabotaging pursuer's website, etc.)
   0  1  2  3  4

37. ISSUE VERBAL WARNINGS/THREATS
   (e.g., articulate punishments or sanctions that the pursuer
   will experience if pursuit continues, threaten the police, violence, etc.)
   0  1  2  3  4

38. USE PHYSICAL VIOLENCE
   (e.g., hit, shove, use a weapon, throw an object,
   blackmail, restrain, beat up, etc.)
   0  1  2  3  4

39. BUILD A LEGAL CASE
   (e.g., save voice mail/e-mail, save gifts/notes,
   keep log of phone calls, try to entrap them)
   0  1  2  3  4

40. PURSUE A LEGAL CASE
   (e.g., sue, swear out a complaint, hire a lawyer,
   pursue indictment on harassment or stalking laws, etc.)
   0  1  2  3  4