

Running head: PERCEPTIONS OF STALKING

Is This Stalking? Perceptions of Stalking Behavior among Young Male and Female Adults in
Hong Kong and Mainland China

Heng Choon (Oliver) Chan, Ph.D.¹

Department of Applied Social Sciences, City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, SAR

&

Lorraine Sheridan, Ph.D.²

School of Psychology and Speech Pathology, Curtin University, Western Australia, Australia

¹ Heng Choon (Oliver) Chan, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Criminology, Department of Applied Social Sciences, City University of Hong Kong, Kowloon, Hong Kong, S.A.R. Tel: (+852) 3442-9223. E-mail: oliverchan.ss@cityu.edu.hk (corresponding author)

² Lorraine Sheridan, Ph.D., Senior Lecturer, School of Psychology and Speech Pathology, Curtin University, Bentley, Western Australia, Australia.

Is This Stalking? Perceptions of Stalking Behavior among Young Male and Female Adults in
Hong Kong and Mainland China

ABSTRACT

Most studies of stalking are conducted with samples from individualist cultures. Little is known about the phenomenon within collectivist cultures. The present study is arguably the first stalking study conducted in Hong Kong. Specifically, this study investigates a large sample of Asian college students' ($N = 2,496$) perceptions of stalking behavior, potential reasons for stalking, and coping strategies that may be employed by stalking victims. Associations between these variables and gender and culture (Hong Kong versus Mainland China) were also explored. Gender was more strongly associated with perceptions of stalking behavior than was culture. Gender was less strongly associated with perceptions concerning motivations for stalking and the effectiveness of coping strategies that may be employed by stalking victims than was culture. Effect sizes for all associations with culture were small, perhaps due to a high degree of similarity between the two cultures examined. The findings are generally supportive of similar results produced by previous work conducted within individualistic Western cultures, suggesting that stalking and the way that it is perceived may be universal in nature. This study concludes with the argument that legislation against stalking needs to be extended to non-Western countries, such as Hong Kong and Mainland China, as anti-stalking laws are relatively scarce outside Western industrialized countries.

Keywords: Stalking, culture, harassment, perceptions, gender

Is This Stalking? Perceptions of Stalking Behavior among Young Male and Female Adults in
Hong Kong and Mainland China

INTRODUCTION

Stalking is a severe societal problem that has attracted significant attention from academics, practitioners, policy makers, and the general public. Rates vary according to the definition of stalking employed within individual studies but it is widely accepted that stalking is not uncommon and may be universal (Sheridan, Scott & Roberts, 2016). Large-scale representative surveys in three different countries point to similar lifetime prevalence rates: one in five UK women and one in 18 UK men (Home Office, 2011), one in five Australian women and one in 12 Australian men (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2016), one in six USA women and one in 19 USA men, (Breiding, Smith, Basile, Walters, Chen, & Merrick, 2014). The mean incidence rate from college population studies (19%) tends to be relatively similar to rates produced by general population studies (see Spitzberg's 2002 meta-analysis of 103 stalking studies).

Stalking lacks a consensus concerning standardized definition, especially among researchers. To illustrate, stalking has been defined in several ways, such as by strict legal definitions that require the stalker to demonstrate intent and the victim to feel fear, or by broader definitions that include lists of constituent behavior (see e.g. Jordan, Wilcox, & Pritchard, 2007; Pereira, Matos, Sheridan, & Scott, 2015; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). Despite the variation in defining stalking and its constituent activities, the negative impact on those victimized by such behavior is clearly substantial. Victims of stalking typically experience a wide array of psychological, physical, social, and financial costs (Spitzberg & Cupach, 2007). For instance, victims may invest in additional security measures and socialize less as a result of their fear of stalking (e.g. Sheridan & Lyndon, 2012); and after continued stalking

victimization, victims and survivors have reported poorer socio-demographic and psychosocial status when compared with controls (e.g. Narud, Friestad & Dahl, 2014).

One research area that has received considerable attention in recent years is perceptions of stalking. Like investigations of actual experience of stalking, explorations of perceptions of different aspects of stalking (e.g., perpetration and victimization) are important. Earlier work has identified misconceptions that the general public hold about stalking behavior and appropriate responses to it, noting that misconceptions, if left unaddressed, may lead to a lack of demand for policy and social change (e.g. Lambert, Smith, Geistman, Cluse-Tolar, & Jiang, 2013).

Gender and Stalking Behavior

Stalking is generally perceived as a gendered offense, with males more likely to be the offenders and females most likely to be the victims (Pathé, Mullen, & Purcell, 2000). In fact, Spitzberg's (2002) meta-analysis reported that over 70% of stalkers are males and over 80% of victims are females. Studies overwhelmingly indicate that opposite-gender stalking is the most prevalent type of stalking (e.g., Kropp, Hart, & Lyon, 2002; Meloy & Gothard, 1995; Mullen, Pathé, Purcell, & Stuart, 1999; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). Nevertheless, same-gender stalking is not uncommon (e.g., Meloy & Boyd, 2003; Pathé, Mullen, & Purcell, 2000; Purcell, Pathé, & Mullen, 2010; Strand & McEwan, 2011).

Research that focuses on perceptions of stalking has primarily sought to identify behavior that people consider to be constituent of stalking (e.g., Dennison & Thomson, 2002; Sheridan & Davies, 2001; Sheridan & Scott, 2010; Yanowitz, 2006). In her American college sample, Yanowitz (2006) found that females selected a larger number of activities as stalking behavior than did males, irrespective of their personal stalking experiences. Similarly, and also using an American college sample, Lambert and colleagues (2013) reported that females were more likely than males to judge that stalking occurred more regularly and was harmful

to the victim, regardless of personal stalking victimization experiences. In McKeon and colleagues' (2015) study of Australian community members and police officers, males were found to endorse problematic stalking myths more strongly than their female counterparts. Nevertheless, there are studies that have failed to report any gender differences in perceptions of stalking behavior (e.g., Cass, 2011; Sheridan, Gillett, & Davies, 2002; Spitzberg & Veksler, 2007).

Cultural Practices and Stalking Behavior

The limited research on cross-cultural comparisons of stalking has demonstrated that differences in cultural practices and values may play a vital role in influencing perceptions of stalking behavior (Chapman & Spitzberg, 2003; Sheridan et al., 2016). Chapman and Spitzberg (2003) found that more American than Japanese students (41% versus 34%) who had been "persistently pursued" tended to believe that their experience constituted stalking. Nevertheless, significantly more Japanese students than their American counterparts perceived their experience as "threatening" (40% versus 11%); and this trend was more noticeable in males. The authors attributed these differences as partly due to the collectivist nature of Japanese society and the individualist nature of American society. As noted by Shavitt and colleagues (2008), individualistic cultures (e.g., the US, the UK, and Australia) are characterized by people who desire independent relationships with others and prioritize their own personal goals over the goals of their larger social groups. Collectivist cultures (e.g., Mainland China, Indonesia, and India), are characterized by people who prefer interdependent relationships with others and prioritize the goals of their larger social groups over their personal ones. It may be that a threat towards an individual may be perceived as a threat towards and disruption within the peer group as a whole.

A more recent large cross-national study conducted by Sheridan and colleagues (2016) of 1,734 female undergraduate samples from 12 countries (i.e., Armenia, Australia, England,

Egypt, Finland, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Portugal, Scotland, and Trinidad) has reported some interesting findings that may relate to cultural differences. Hofstede's dimensions of national cultures (see Hofstede, 1979), including a measure of individualism/collectivism, were adopted in this study, along with the Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM; to measure gender inequality and females' relative empowerment between countries). Sheridan and colleagues (2016) reported that females from countries scoring lower on individualism (e.g., Indonesia, Trinidad) reported more severe intrusions (e.g., forced sexual contact, being spied upon), while women from countries with higher individualism scores (e.g. Finland, Scotland) reported more innocuous intrusions (such as being asked for dates, or being asked for casual sex at social events). Further, the GEM and individualism-collectivism scores correlated (.60), with lower gender equality ratings being related to high collectivism scores and vice versa. These findings are in line with Archer's (2006) cross-cultural findings on violence, in which females' susceptibility to male aggression was negatively correlated with both individualism and gender empowerment. Clearly, cultural influences on perceptions and experiences of stalking and intrusive behavior are apparent and should not be overlooked. Studies examining these variables may be able to provide indicators of how acceptable stalking is considered to be in different locations, particularly given that stalking is so difficult to define. As such the limited literature requires expansion.

THE PRESENT STUDY

Geographically located in the Asia Pacific region, Hong Kong has been a special administrative region (SAR) of the People's Republic of China (PRC) since July 1997. With approximately 95% of its population of Chinese descent, Hong Kong is a modernized Chinese society and is one of the major financial hubs in Asia Pacific. Before its return to the PRC, Hong Kong was a British colony for more than 150 years. Therefore, substantial Western influences on the daily life of Hong Kongers are expected. Specifically, younger

people in Hong Kong generally balance their Western modernized lifestyle with traditional Chinese cultural values and practices. In contrast, the way of life of Chinese Mainlanders is largely follows traditional Chinese teachings and cultural values¹, although modernization with Westernized influences is evident in some megacities in recent decades (e.g., Shanghai, Beijing, and Guangzhou).

Stalking may be conceptualized as an old behavior, but a new crime (Meloy, 1999). The first anti-stalking law was only enacted in the U.S. in 1990 (Meloy, 2007). It is not regarded as a crime in a majority of countries, particularly in most non-Western countries (Sheridan et al., 2016). Stalking is yet to be legislated against in Hong Kong. Although the Hong Kong Law Reform Commission (LRC) published a report on stalking in 2000 (The Law Reform Commission of Hong Kong, 2000), the severity of stalking offenses did not receive much attention until the Hong Kong Government published a consultation paper to consult the public on an anti-stalking law in December 2011 (Hong Kong Government, 2011). When the consultation period ended in March 2012, the Government commissioned a consultant to study the experience of overseas jurisdictions in implementing anti-stalking legislation, and findings were presented to the Legislative Council Panel on Constitutional Affairs in December 2013 (Centre for Comparative and Public Law of the University of Hong Kong, 2013). Nothing has been announced by the Government since then.

Given this, the present study is important in two ways. Arguably the first study in Hong Kong, **the present work aims to examine perceptions of stalking perpetration and victimization among post-secondary educated young male and female adults from Hong**

¹ Traditional Chinese culture, shaped by a tradition of four thousand years of history and maintained by the same language, provides Chinese Mainlanders their basic identity. This cultural value system distinguishes it from other cultures, particularly Western cultures. Traditional Chinese culture consists of diverse and sometimes competing schools of thought, including Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism. For instance, Confucianism largely forms the foundation of Chinese cultural tradition, which emphasizes human relationships, social structures, virtuous behavior, and work ethics (Pye, 1972). The basic teaching of Confucius stresses the Five Constant Virtues (i.e., humanity, righteousness, propriety, wisdom, and faithfulness), which further define the five basic human relations and principles for each relation (i.e., loyalty and duty, love and obedience, obligation and submission, seniority and modeling subject, and trust; Ch'en, 1986). Thus, relationships are structured to ensure a harmonious society, with emphasis on filial piety and loyalty as the most important virtues.

Kong and Mainland China, recruited at 10 Hong Kong universities. The study explores overall perceptions of stalking behavior, perceived reasons for stalking perpetration, and perceived effectiveness of victim coping strategies. Differences that may relate to gender and culture were also examined, as earlier works indicate that males and females and those from different cultural backgrounds may differ in their perceptions of stalking (e.g., Lambert et al., 2013; Scott, Rajakaruna, Sheridan, & Gavin, 2014; Sheridan, Scott, & Roberts, 2016).

Notably, both Hong Kong and Mainland China are culturally collectivist. However, the most recent Hofstede scores indicate that mainland China is overall more collectivist than Hong Kong, with an individualism-collectivism score of 20 for mainland China and a score of 25 for Hong Kong (<https://geert-hofstede.com/national-culture.html>, retrieved March 20th 2017). Although this difference is not great (Australia, for example, has a Hofstede score of 90 for individualism-collectivism), we would expect some cultural influence on how stalking is viewed overall, as previous work has identified cultural differences even in countries whose individualism-collectivism scores were not far apart (see Sheridan et al., 2016). Based on previous findings, respondents from more highly collectivist countries would be expected to be more accepting of aggressive courtship, and we also may expect to find some differences in perceptions of coping strategies and triggers for stalking, as interpretations of these would be expected to relate to how stalking is viewed overall.

Although a plethora of literature on perceptions of stalking is now available, most of these studies were conducted within individualist cultures (e.g., Australia, the U.S., and the U.K.). As Chapman and Spitzberg (2003) argued, findings generated from samples obtained from individualist cultures cannot be generalized to collectivist cultures. This makes the present study essential to advancing our knowledge on the topic. Secondly, the findings of this study are anticipated to inform practice in relation to social services for victims of stalking, and development or refinement of public and social policies to help curb the

phenomenon of stalking perpetration. It was anticipated that gender would influence perceptions of stalking, with females more likely to judge a range of intrusive items as constituent of stalking. No predictions were made concerning gendered judgments regarding reasons for stalking and the effectiveness of victim coping strategies. It was anticipated that culture would influence judgments of what constituted stalking, but that this difference would not be great as both the cultures examined are largely collectivist.

METHOD

Participants and Procedure

Participants were recruited from eight public (i.e., government-funded) and two private universities in Hong Kong. These public universities and their approximate total enrolment numbers are as follows: City University of Hong Kong (18,000), Hong Kong Baptist University (8,200), Hong Kong Institute of Education (8,500), Lingnan University of Hong Kong (4,400), Polytechnic University of Hong Kong (29,000), The Chinese University of Hong Kong (19,900), The University of Hong Kong (27,400), and The University of Science and Technology (14,200). Open University of Hong Kong and Shue Yan University were the two private universities, with total enrolments approximating 16,100 and 2,800 respectively. Ethical approval was obtained from the first author's university prior to the administration of this study. Participants were either approached randomly within university compounds (e.g., student cafeterias, reading corners, libraries, and common areas) with no preset time period. With prior consent from the relevant instructors, participants were also recruited through different academic courses during their class break or end of class session. The participants' informed consent was obtained, with acknowledgment that their participation in this study was completely voluntary and without any monetary reward. Participants were assured that their responses to the anonymous paper-pencil questionnaire

would be kept confidential and used only for research purposes. An average of 25 minutes was required to complete the questionnaire. The response and cooperation rate for the survey was about 90%.

This study sampled 2,496 participants, with 55.8% being female ($N = 1,392$) and the remaining 44.2% male ($N = 1,104$). On average, participants were aged 21.42 years ($SD = 2.93$, range 17-48). Males, on average, were aged 21.88 years ($SD = 3.28$), while the average age of females was 21.06 ($SD = 2.58$); and this difference was significant ($t = 6.78$, $p < .001$). A large majority of the participants were Hong Kongers (74%; $N = 1,846$), and 21.9% ($N = 546$) were from Mainland China. The remaining participants (4.2%; $N = 104$) were international exchange students from other countries (e.g., Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, India, the USA, Canada, England, Germany, and the Netherlands). These respondents were excluded from analyses that included culture as a variable. Nearly two-thirds (65.2%) of the participants were single and about three quarters (72.6%) reported having no particular religious belief. Almost all participants reported they had completed at least secondary school education (99.7%).

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

Measures

Self-report measures were adopted to assess participants' (i) perceptions of stalking behavior, (ii) perceived reasons for stalking perpetration, and (iii) perceived effective coping strategies for stalking victims. The questionnaire with these measures was printed in both English and Chinese versions for participants with different language needs. To accommodate the local Chinese population, the English written scales were initially translated by an experienced and academically qualified English-to-Chinese translator. Next, the Chinese version scales were back translated to English to ascertain face validity, and to compare with the original English written scales to assure content similarity.

(i) Perceptions of Stalking Behavior

A scale comprising 12 stalking behavior was adopted from Amar's (2006) study. Of these items, nine were taken from Tjaden and Thoennes' (1998) "National Violence Against Women Survey" (NVAWS), and the remaining three items were found in the stalking literature that described stalking behaviors (Amar, 2006). Three stalking categories were used with four items each in the categories of 'surveillance', 'approach', and 'intimidation and aggression'. Participants were not supplied any context and nor were they instructed to adopt a particular role (e.g. recipient of the behavior). Rather, they were asked: "Which of the following behaviors would you perceive as a stalking behavior?" The response format was "yes/no". Sample items include, "Followed or spied on you" (surveillance item), "Made unsolicited phone calls to you" (approach item), and "Ever threatened to harm or kill you" (intimidation and aggression item). The Cronbach's α of this measure was .79 (males = .80, females = .76) in the present study and .83 in Amar's (2006) work.

(ii) Perceived Reasons for Stalking Perpetration

Baum and colleagues' (2009) items measuring victim perceptions of why stalking began were adopted in this study. A scale of 12 items was used to assess participants' perceived reasons for the offender to engage in stalking perpetration. A "yes/no" response format was utilized to determine whether items were perceived as reasons to initiate stalking perpetration. Sample items include, "Different cultural beliefs/back-ground", "To control the victim," and "To keep the victim in the relationship." The internal consistency of this measure was 0.82 (males = .81, females = .83) in the present work.

(iii) Perceived Effective Coping Strategies of Stalking Victimization

A stalking coping survey, based on a comprehensive literature review, was created by Cupach and Spitzberg (2004) and later employed by Amar and Alexy (2010). The survey was adopted in this study to measure participants' perceived effectiveness of strategies that could

be employed to cope with stalking victimization. This 40-item scale assesses five categories of coping tactics (i.e., moving inward, moving outward, moving away, moving toward or with, and moving against). A “yes/no” response format was used to determine whether participants perceived the items as effective coping strategies. Sample items include, “Deny the problem” (moving inward tactic), “Engage in social support” (moving outward tactic), “Ignore the stalker’s behavior” (moving away tactic), “Bargain with the stalker” (moving toward or with tactic), and “Issue verbal warnings or threats to the stalker” (moving against tactic). Cronbach’s alpha was .79 (males = .80, females = .76) in the current study and .88 in Amar and Alexy’s (2010) work.

Analytic Strategy

In this study, descriptive statistics were presented to illustrate (i) participants’ perceptions of stalking behavior, (ii) perceived reasons for stalking perpetration, and (iii) perceived effective coping strategies for stalking victimization. In addition, chi-square analyses were performed to examine associations between these perceptions and gender and culture. Regression analyses explored which of gender and culture had the strongest relationship with the dependent variables.

RESULTS

(i) Associations between Gender and Culture and Perceptions of Stalking Behavior

Mean scores for male and female ratings of stalking behavior, and local and non-local (i.e., Chinese Mainlanders) ratings of stalking behavior are presented in Table 2. In general, a high degree of consensus (i.e., above 80%) was evident for half of the 12 items in terms of whether they were considered as stalking behavior. Interestingly, gender differences in perceptions of stalking behavior were observed for nine items. Relative to males, significantly more females perceived the nine items to constitute stalking. Two of the three non-significant items were those with the lowest levels of general agreement that they were

stalking. Four items were found to differ significantly between Chinese Mainlanders and Hong Kongers. As with gender, significant differences between cultural groups tended to occur in relation to those items that most participants judged to constitute stalking.

Nonetheless, these differences were not great and their effect size was rather weak.

A multiple linear regression was performed with yes/no response ratings of the 12 stalking behavior summed to form the dependent variable. Participant gender and place of origin (Hong Kong versus Mainland China) were the independent variables. The overall model was significant, $F(1, 2134) = 24.42, p < .001$, as were both of the independent variables. Combined, gender and place (Hong Kong versus Mainland China) explained 23% of the variance, with place contributing just 4%. Unstandardized beta scores for gender and place were and $-.74$ and $-.13$ respectively.

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

(ii) Associations between Gender and Culture and Perceived Reasons for Stalking Perpetration

As shown in Table 3, only three items produced at least 70% consensus that they were reasons for offenders to perpetrate stalking behavior. Despite the low consensus for most items, gender differences were found for three of the reasons. Relative to females, significantly more males considered “The stalker perceived the victim liked the attention” (25.6% versus 19.7%) and “The victim was from a different cultural belief or background” (15.7% versus 13.1%) to be reasons for stalking. Conversely, significantly more females than males perceived “The stalker was lonely and the victim was a convenient target” (29% versus 24.1%) to be a reason to engage in stalking behavior. Pertaining to the perceptions of Hong Kongers and Chinese Mainlanders, significantly more Hong Kongers regarded “The stalker liked the attention given by the victim” (48% versus 37.8%) and “The stalker perceived the victim liked the attention” (23.8% versus 18.3%) to be offending motives. In contrast,

significantly more Chinese Mainlanders perceived the reasons to be “The stalker was lonely and the victim was a convenient target” (33.2% versus 25.1%) and “The victim was from a different cultural belief or background” (17% versus 13.7%). Again, differences with large effect sizes relating to perceived reasons for stalking perpetration were not observed.

A multiple linear regression was performed with yes/no response ratings of the 12 potential reasons for stalking perpetration summed to form the dependent variable. Participant gender and place of origin (Hong Kong versus Mainland China) were the independent variables. The overall model was significant, $F(1, 2494) = 4.47, p < .04$, but only one independent variable was, namely place of origin, which explained just 2% of the variance, with gender not contributing. Unstandardized beta scores for gender and place were .06 and -.14 respectively.

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

(iii) Associations between Gender and Culture and Perceived Effective Coping Strategies for Stalking Victimization

Mean scores for perceived effective coping strategies based on gender and culture practices are presented in Table 4. Out of 40 possibilities, only three coping strategies were found to have a high degree of consensus (i.e., above 80%) that they would be effective; namely “Engage in legal or law enforcement input” (87.9%), a moving outward tactic; and “Build a legal case against the stalker” (85.2%) and (similarly) “Pursue a legal case against the stalker” (81.3%), both moving against tactics. Gender differences in perceived effective coping strategies were found for 26 items: in all five of the moving outward tactics, in six moving away tactics, five moving inward tactics, five moving toward or with tactics, and five moving against tactics. Women were more likely to endorse entering therapy and engaging the support of third parties as effective coping strategies, along with building a legal case, creating distance between victim and stalker, and victim relocation. Men were more likely to

endorse the following strategies as effective: trying to deceive and bargain with the stalker, take an aggressive stance towards the stalker and threaten and physical assault the stalker, to deny the problem and detach and depersonalize.

Differences between Hong Kongers and Chinese Mainlanders regarding some coping strategies perceived as effective were also noted; namely six moving away tactics, six moving against tactics, four moving inward tactics, four moving outward tactics, and three moving toward or with tactics. In 20 cases, Chinese mainlanders were more likely to endorse a particular strategy as effective; Hong Kongers did so in relation to just three items. Despite the observed differences in gender and cultural practices, the effect of these differences was not large in general.

A multiple linear regression was performed with yes/no response ratings of the 40 responses to coping with stalking summed to form the dependent variable. Participant gender and place of origin (Hong Kong versus Mainland China) were the independent variables. The overall model was significant, $F(1, 1980) = 8.54, p < .004$, but only one independent variable was significant, namely place of origin, which explained just 4% of the variance, with gender contributing zero. Unstandardized beta scores for gender and place were and $-.26$ and -1.30 respectively.

INSERT TABLE 4 HERE

DISCUSSION

Using a large sample of young male and female adults recruited at 10 universities in Hong Kong, the present study examined perceptions of 12 stalking behavior, 12 potential reasons for stalking perpetration, and 40 coping strategies for victims of stalking. The primary aim was to conduct the first study of perceptions of stalking within an Asian sample, and also to explore associations between these perceptions and participant gender and culture.

This is the first known study to compare the relative contributions of gender and culture to perceptions of stalking and stalking-related phenomena.

The findings of this study suggest that there are some significant differences in perceptions of stalking between males and females, and between Hong Kongers and Chinese Mainlanders. Relative to males, significantly more females perceived the listed surveillance, approach, intimidation, and aggressive activities as stalking behavior. This may be due to the fact that females more commonly experience stalking victimization than males (e.g. Baum et al., 2009; Sheridan, Blaauw, & Davies, 2003), and defensive attribution theory may in turn explain these more severe judgments (see e.g., Elkins, Philips, & Konopaske, 2002, as cited in Scott et al., 2015). This theory asserts that if a person is making a judgment in a situation where they share some attributes with a potential victim of wrongdoing, then they will make more extreme judgments. An alternative explanation concerns the 'gender gap' (Whitehead & Blankenship, 2000, as cited in Lambert et al., 2013). That is, women generally are more liberal in their perceptions of social issues and more supportive of progressive social causes and demonstrated a greater willingness to extend rights to minority groups and women. It has long been noted that the gender gap as evidenced by opinion polling transcends culture and nationality (see Boulding, 1984).

Although mixed findings have been produced by earlier studies, with some works finding that women are more likely to identify intrusive behavior than men (e.g. Finnegan & Fritz, 2012; Lambert et al., 2013; Yanowitz, 2006), and others not finding this association (see e.g. Cass, 2011; Sheridan, Gillett, & Davies, 2002, Spitzberg & Veksler, 2007), an opposing pattern of males being more likely to judge intrusive acts as constituting stalking has not been seen. As such, we may state that the judgments of Hong Kong and Chinese females generally support previous findings from the U.K., the U.S., and Australia that women are more likely than men to view intrusive acts as stalking.

Gender was found to explain far more of the variance in relation to judgments of stalking behavior than was culture (23% as compared with 4%). Perhaps, acculturation of Mainland Chinese students to Hong Kong culture has resulted in their psychological adaptation to the host culture and way of life (Yu, Stewart, Liu, & Lam, 2014). As noted, acculturation is an important feature in understanding international students and immigrants' adaptation to a new environment (Tartakovsky, 2007). Although some specific cultural practices can be observed, people in Hong Kong and Mainland China generally follow traditional Chinese values and norms. Therefore, small differences found in their perceptions of stalking are not unreasonable. Future work should compare countries that differ more widely in terms of variables such as individualism/collectivism, participant gender, and gender empowerment. It is yet to know which of these has the greatest influence on perceptions of stalking and other intrusive activities. The present findings may provide clues but, given the potential cultural similarity between Hong Kong and Mainland China, cannot provide clear answers.

With regard to perceived reasons for stalking perpetration and perceived effectiveness of various coping strategies, significant gender differences and differences between Hong Kongers and Chinese Mainlanders were not generally found. Gender differences identified in relation to coping strategies tended to conform to gender role expectations. Women were more likely to endorse the strategies of seeking therapy, engaging the support of various third parties (including their social circle and the police), relocating, behaving cautiously and staying away from the stalker. Men, alternatively, were more likely to endorse moving towards and moving against items that included using physical and other forms of aggression against the stalker, denying the problem, and engaging in self-destructive escapism. Even where significant group differences were noted, however, they were not large. As such, we may argue that, participants, regardless of their gender and country of origin, shared

relatively similar perceptions regarding likely reasons for stalking perpetration and effective coping strategies for stalking victims. Sheridan and colleagues (2003) asserted that stalking is difficult to clearly define, and noted that some legislation comprehensively details which behavior are punishable while laws in other countries apply only broad terms. In yet other countries (including Mainland China and Hong Kong) specific anti-stalking legislation does not exist. Regardless, the findings of the present work support those of similar works that found generally high levels of agreement that various core behaviors constitute stalking. It may be that it is not necessary for stalking to be on the statute books for people to understand what types of behavior make up the phenomenon. This speaks to a potential universality of perceptions of stalking. The regression analyses indicated that overall, culture had a small but significant relationship with perceptions of stalking motivations and coping strategies, with gender not contributing to the models. Future studies then, should not only examine which of culture and gender have the greatest bearing on perceptions of stalking, but also which have the largest association with different *aspects* of stalking perceptions.

Future studies of stalking perceptions need to move away from a tight focus on the participant-specific variables of gender and personal experience of stalking. The literature tends to produce small effect sizes (e.g. Finnegan & Fritz, 2012; Lambert et al., 2012; Scott, et al., 2015). Where studies have included other variables, the findings are not easily interpreted. For instance, Lambert et al.'s male college students were more likely than female students to perceive stalking as involving strangers, but were also more likely than females to blame stalking victims. So what factor explains the largest proportion of the variance? Could it be age, education level, authoritarian attitudes, or personality factors? Only comprehensive research can help us to answer this question. Until then, it is suggested that culture continues to be explored as an important variable relating to attitudes towards and perceptions of stalking. That the current findings support those of previous works undertaken

within Western individualistic countries is worthy of note and adds further fuel to the assertion that stalking may be universal. As such, we can argue that legislation against stalking needs to be extended to non-Western countries, as currently anti-stalking laws would appear to be scarce outside Western industrialized nations (there is no all-encompassing up to date list but a good overview may be found at <https://www.stalkingriskprofile.com/what-is-stalking/stalking-legislation/international-legislation>). At present, most stalking-related offenses in Hong Kong and Mainland China are dealt with via the issuance of restraining orders as a majority of cases appear to be domestically-oriented (e.g., ex-spouse, ex-boyfriend/girlfriend). Under the protection of civil law in Hong Kong, victims of stalking could pursue for compensation in the forms of private nuisance (i.e., the perpetrator has interfered with the ordinary and reasonable use or enjoyment of the victim's property) or trespass to the person (i.e., attempted or actual battery or assault against the victim; Lee & Lam, 2015). Nonetheless, the current criminal justice actions are not sufficient to address the issue well.

The present work has a number of strengths and weaknesses. The Chinese Mainlanders no longer lived in Mainland China. Rather, they were studying in Hong Kong. Still, it is worthy of note that significant differences were identified between the two groups. Of course, the sample is not representative of either location. A student sample was chosen on the basis of comparability to prior studies based on student samples, rather than representativeness. The sample may perhaps be considered representative of the wider Hong Kong student population, given its large size and the more than 90% response rate.

In conclusion, the present study has indicated that gender was more strongly associated with a large sample's perceptions of stalking activities than was culture. Conversely, gender was not found to be associated with perceptions concerning motivations for stalking and the effectiveness of coping strategies that may be employed by stalking

victims, whereas culture was. However, culture alone explained very little of the variance.

The significant but small associations with culture may be explained by a high degree of similarity between the two cultures examined, and suggests that comparisons of more diverse nations may produce interesting results. It is suggested that future studies take a mixed methods approach in order to provide context for the judgments made. This may provide insight into why gender and culture may be differentially associated with different aspects of stalking perceptions. The present results further point to universality of stalking behavior, in that findings supported those produced within individualistic western cultures. As such, it is suggested that stalking specific legislation be encouraged in countries where it does not presently exist. In addition, those who provide counseling and other support services to both victims and perpetrators of interpersonal crime should be made aware of both the devastating impact of stalking and its ubiquitous nature.

REFERENCES

- Amar, A. F. (2006). College women's experience of stalking: Mental health symptoms and changes in routines. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing, 20*(3), 108-116. doi: 10.1016/j.apnu.2005.10.003.
- Amar, A. F., & Alexy, E. M. (2010). Coping with stalking. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 31*(1), 8-14. doi: 10.3109/01612840903225602.
- Archer, J. (2006). Cross-cultural differences in physical aggression between partners: A social-role analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10*(2), 133-153. doi: 10.1207/s15327957pspr1002_3
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2016). *Data from the 2005 Personal Safety Survey*. Canberra, Australia: Australian Bureau of Statistics. Retrieved from Australian Bureau of Statistics website: <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/4906.0Chapter9002012>
- Baum, K., Catalano, S., Rand, M., & Rose, K. (2009). *National Crime Victimization Survey: Stalking victimization in the United States*. (NCJ No. 224527). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Bjerregaard, B. (2002). An empirical study of stalking victimization. In K. Davis, I. Frieze, & R. Maiuro (Eds.), *Stalking: Perspectives on victims and perpetrators* (pp. 112-137). New York, NY: Springer Publishing.
- Breiding, M. J., Smith, S. G., Basile, K. C., Walters, M. L., Chen, J., & Merrick, M. T. (2014). *Prevalence and characteristics of sexual violence, stalking, and intimate partner violence victimization – National intimate partner and sexual violence survey, United States, 2011*. Retrieved from Centers for Disease Control and Prevention website: <http://www.cdc.gov>
- Björklund, K., Häkkänen-Nyholm, H., Roberts, K., & Sheridan, L. (2010). The prevalence of stalking among Finnish university students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*(4), 684-698. doi: 10.1177/0886260509334405.
- Boulding, E. (1984). The Gender Gap. *Journal of Peace Research, 21*(1), 1-3.
- Cass, A. (2011). Defining stalking: The influence of legal factors, extralegal factors, and particular actions on judgments of college students. *Western Criminology Review, 12*(1), 1-14.
- Centre for Comparative and Public Law of The University of Hong Kong. (December 2013). *Study on the experience of overseas jurisdictions in implementing anti-stalking legislation*. Hong Kong: The University of Hong Kong. Available at http://www.cmab.gov.hk/en/upload/CR_Full_Report.pdf
- Ch'en, C. (1986). *Neo-Confucian terms explained*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Chapman, D. E., & Spitzberg, B. H. (2003). Are you following me? A study of unwanted relationship pursuit and stalking in Japan: What behavior are prevalent? *Hijiyama University Bulletin, 10*, 89-117.
- Cupach, W. R., & Spitzberg, B. H. (2004). *The dark side of relationship pursuit: From attraction to obsession and stalking*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dennison, S., & Thomson, D. (2000). Identifying stalking: The relevance of intent in commonsense reasoning. *Law and Human Behavior, 26*(5), 543-561. doi: 10.1023/A:1020256022568.
- Dressing, H., Kuehner, C., & Gass, P. (2005). Lifetime prevalence and impact of stalking in a European

- population: Epidemiological data from a middle-sized German city. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 187(2), 168-172. doi: 10.1192/bjp.187.2.168
- Finnegan, H. A., & Timmons Fritz, P. A. (2012). Differential effects of gender on perceptions of stalking and harassment behavior. *Violence and Victims*, 27, 895-910. doi: 10.1891/0886-6708.27.6.895
- Hall, P., & Smith, K. (2011). *Analysis of the 2010/11 British Crime Survey intimate personal violence split sample experiment* (Home Office Methodology Report). London, UK: Home Office. Retrieved from <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk>
- Hofstede, G. (1979). Value systems in forty countries: Interpretation, validation and consequences for theory. In L. H. Eckensberger, W. J. Lonner & Y. H. Poortinga (Eds.), *Cross-cultural contributions to psychology* (pp. 389-407). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Home Office. (2012). Homicides, Firearm offences and intimate violence 2009/10; Supplementary Volume 2 to Crime in England and Wales 2009/10 2nd Edition. Home Office Statistical Bulletin 01/11. London: Home Office.
- Hong Kong Government. (December 2011). *Consultation paper on stalking*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Special Administrative Region Government. Available at http://www.cmab.gov.hk/en/upload/Consultation_Paper_on_Stalking_E.pdf
- Jordan, C. E., Wilcox, P., & Pritchard, A. J. (2007). Stalking acknowledgement and reporting among college women experiencing intrusive behavior: Implications for the emergence of a "classic stalking case." *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35(5), 556-569. doi: 10.1016/j.crimjus.2007.07.008.
- Kropp, P. R., Hart, S. D., & Lyon, D. (2002). Risk assessment of stalkers: Some problems and possible solutions. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 29(5), 590-616. doi: 10.1177/009385402236734.
- Lambert, E. G., Smith, B., Geistman, J., Cluse-Tolar, T., & Jiang, S. (2013). Do men and women differ in their perceptions of stalking: An exploratory study among college students. *Violence and Victims*, 28(2), 195-209. doi: 10.1891/0886-6708.09-201.
- Lee, R., & Lam, T. (January 2015). *I am being stalked: How can the law help me obtain compensation?* Available at <http://www.hk-lawyer.org/content/i-am-being-stalked-how-can-law-help-me-obtain-compensation>
- McKeon, B., McEwan, T. E., & Luebbers, S. (2015). "It's not really stalking if you know the person": Measuring community attitudes that normalize, justify and minimize stalking. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, 22(2), 291-306. doi: 10.1080/13218719.2014.945637.
- Meloy, J. R. (1999). Stalking: An old behavior, a new crime. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 22(1), 85-99. doi: 10.1016/S0193-953X(05)70061-7.
- Meloy, J. R. (2007). Stalking: The state of the science. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 17(1), 1-7. doi: 10.1002/cbm.642.
- Meloy, J. R., & Boyd, C. (2003). Female stalkers and their victims. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 31(2), 211-219.
- Meloy, J. R., & Gothard, S. (1995). Demographic and clinical comparison of obsessional followers and offenders with mental disorders. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 152(2), 258-263. doi: 10.1176/ajp.152.2.258.
- Mullen, P. E., Pathé, M., Purcell, R., & Stuart, G. (1999). Study of stalkers. *American Journal of*

- Psychiatry*, 156(8), 1244-1249.
- Narud, K., Friestad, C., & Dahl, A. A. (2014). Stalking experiences and associated factors—A controlled population-based study from Norway. *Nordic Journal of Psychiatry*, 68(5), 347-354. doi: 10.3109/08039488.2013.844273.
- Pathé, M., & Mullen, P. (1997). The impact of stalkers on their victims. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 170(1), 12-17. doi: 10.1192/bjp.170.1.12.
- Pathé, M. T., Mullen, P. E., & Purcell, R. (2000). Same gender stalking. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 28(2), 191-197.
- Pereira, F., Matos, M., Sheridan, L., & Scott, A. J. (2015). Perceptions and personal experiences of unwanted attention among Portuguese male students. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 21(4), 398-411. doi: 10.1080/1068316X.2014.989167.
- Phillips, L., Quirk, R., Rosenfeld, B., & O'Connor, M. (2004). Is it stalking? Perceptions of stalking among college undergraduates. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 31(1), 73-96. doi: 10.1177/0093854803259251.
- Purcell, R., Pathé, M., & Mullen, P. (2010). Gender differences in stalking behavior among juveniles. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 21(4), 555-568. doi: 10.1080/14789940903572035.
- Pye, L. W. (1972). *China: An introduction*. Boston, MA: Little Brown.
- Scott, A. J., Rajakaruna, N., & Sheridan, L. (2014). Framing and perceptions of stalking: The influence of conduct severity and the perpetrator-target relationship. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 20(3), 242-260. doi: 10.1080/1068316X.2013.770856.
- Scott, A. J., Rajakaruna, N., Sheridan, L., & Gavin, J. (2015). International perceptions of relational stalking: The influence of prior relationship, perpetrator sex, target sex, and participant sex. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 30(18), 3308-3323. doi: 10.1177/0886260514555012.
- Shavitt, S., Lee, A. Y., & Johnson, T. P. (2008). Cross-cultural consumer psychology. In C.P. Haugtvedt, P.M. Herr, & F.R. Kardes (Eds.), *Handbook of consumer psychology* (pp. 1103-1131). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Sheridan, L., & Davies, G. (2001). What is stalking? The match between legislation and public perception. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 6(1), 3-17. doi: 10.1348/135532501168163.
- Sheridan, L., & Lyndon, A. (2012). The influence of prior relationship, gender, and fear on the consequences of stalking. *Sex Roles*, 66, 340-350. doi 10.1007/s11199-010-9889-9.
- Sheridan, L., & Scott, A. (2010). Perceptions of harm: Verbal versus physical abuse in stalking scenarios. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37(4), 400-416. doi: 10.1177/0093854809359743.
- Sheridan, L., Blaauw, E., & Davies, G. (2003). Stalking: Knowns and unknowns. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 4(2), 148-162. doi: 10.1177/1524838002250766.
- Sheridan, L., Gillett, R., & Davies, G. (2002). Perceptions and prevalence of stalking in a male sample. *Psychology, Crime and Law*, 8(4), 289-310. doi: 10.1080/10683160208401821.
- Sheridan, L., Scott, A. J., & Roberts, K. (2016). Young women's experiences of intrusive behavior in 12 countries. *Aggressive Behavior*, 42(1), 41-53. doi: 10.1002/ab.21604.

- Spitzberg, B. H. (2002). The tactical topography of stalking victimization and management. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 3*(4), 261-288. doi: 10.1177/1524838002237330.
- Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (2007). The state of the art of stalking: Taking stock of the emerging literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 12*(1), 64-86. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2006.05.001.
- Spitzberg, B., & Veksler, A. (2007). The personality of pursuit: Personality attributions of unwanted pursuers and stalkers. *Violence and Victims, 22*(3), 275-289. doi: 10.1891/088667007780842838.
- Strand, S., & McEwan, T. E. (2011). Same-gender stalking in Sweden and Australia. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 29*(2), 202-219. doi: 10.1002/bsl.981.
- Tartakovsky, E. (2007). A longitudinal study of acculturative stress and homesickness: High-school adolescents immigrating from Russia and Ukraine to Israel without parents. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology, 42*(6), 485-494. doi: 10.1007/s00127-007-0184-1.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1998). *Stalking in America: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey* (NCJ Publication No. 169592). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, and National Institute for Justice, Center for Disease Control and Prevention.
- The Law Reform Commission of Hong Kong. (October 2000). *Report: Stalking*. Hong Kong: The Law Reform Commission of Hong Kong. Available at <http://www.hkreform.gov.hk/en/docs/rstalk-e.pdf>
- Triandis, H. C. (2001). Individualism-collectivism and personality. *Journal of Personality, 69*(6), 907-924. doi: 10.1111/1467-6494.696169.
- van der Aa, S., & Kunst, M. (2009). The prevalence of stalking in the Netherlands. *International Review of Victimology, 16*(1), 35-50. doi: 10.1177/026975800901600102.
- Whitehead, J. T., & Blankenship, M. B. (2000). The gender gap in capital punishment attitudes: An analysis of support and opposition. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 25*(1), 1-13.
- Yanowitz, K. (2006). Influence of gender and experience on college students' stalking schemas. *Violence and Victims, 21*(1), 91-100. doi: 10.1891/0886-6708.21.1.91.
- Yu, X., Stewart, S. M., Liu, I. K. F., & Lam, T. H. (2014). Resilience and depressive symptoms in mainland Chinese immigrants to Hong Kong. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology, 49*(2), 241-249. doi: 10.1007/s00127-013-0733-8.

Table 1 Sample demographic characteristics ($N = 2,496$)

Variable	<i>N</i>	Percentage
Gender	($N = 2,496$)	
Male	1,104	44.2%
Female	1,392	55.8%
Country of origin	($N = 2,496$)	
Hong Kong	1,846	74.0%
Mainland China	546	21.9%
Others	104	4.2%
(e.g., Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, India, US, Canada, England, Germany, the Netherlands)		
Marital status	($N = 2,475$)	
Single	1,614	65.2%
Married or unmarried partnership	852	34.4%
Separated or divorced	9	0.3%
Religious belief	($N = 2,475$)	
Without a religious belief	1,796	72.6%
With a religious belief	679	27.4%
(e.g., Catholic, Buddhist, Christian, Muslim)		
Highest education attainment	($N = 2,484$)	
Primary school education	8	0.3%
Secondary school education	1,726	69.5%
University education	750	30.2%
(e.g., associate degree/higher diploma, undergraduate and postgraduate degrees)		

Table 2 Gender differences ($N = 2,496$) and differences in country of origin ($N = 2,392$) on perceptions of stalking behavior

Items ($\alpha = .79$ [male = .80, female = .76])	Perceived as an Stalking Behavior (%)						
	Overall	Male	Female	χ^2 (Phi)	Hong Kong	Mainland China	χ^2 (Phi)
Surveillance items							
1. Followed or spied on you	89.9	86.9	92.4	17.74 (-0.09) ***	89.8	90.5	0.17 (-0.01)
2. Contacted your friends or family to learn of your whereabouts	83.8	79.3	87.7	27.88 (-0.11) ***	83.5	85.1	0.74 (-0.02)
3. Stood outside your home, school, or workplace	72.6	66.2	78.0	37.85 (-0.13) ***	72.4	71.2	0.25 (0.01)
4. Showed up at places you were although he had no business being there	71.3	64.6	77.0	40.81 (-0.14) ***	71.4	70.2	0.24 (0.01)
Approach items							
5. Sent unsolicited or harassing emails to you	84.3	82.4	86.0	5.30 (-0.05) *	83.4	86.8	3.17 (-0.04) *
6. Tried to communicate with you against your will	75.4	69.0	80.8	40.41 (0.14) ***	75.3	76.6	0.60 (0.02)
7. Made unsolicited phone calls to you	29.8	28.2	31.2	2.35 (-0.03)	29.1	27.2	0.63 (0.02)
8. Sent you unsolicited letters or written correspondence	24.8	24.8	24.8	0.85 (0.02)	24.2	21.5	4.85 (0.05)
Intimidation and aggression items							
9. Made you feel fearful for your safety or life	91.9	89.1	94.3	19.81 (-0.10) ***	90.9	95.8	11.74 (-0.08) ***
10. Ever threatened to harm or kill you	91.3	89.5	92.8	7.37 (-0.06) **	90.7	93.6	3.97 (-0.04) *
11. Vandalized your property or destroyed something you loved	83.0	82.4	83.5	0.47 (-0.02)	81.4	88.1	11.54 (-0.07) ***
12. Left unwanted items for you to find	36.5	33.3	39.2	10.30 (0.07) **	34.7	37.9	2.10 (0.03)

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 3 Gender differences ($N = 2,496$) and differences in country of origin ($N = 2,392$) on perceived reasons for stalking perpetration

Items ($\alpha = .82$ [male = .81, female = .83])	Perceived Reasons for Stalking Perpetration (%)						
	Overall	Male	Female	χ^2 (Phi)	Hong Kong	Mainland China	χ^2 (Phi)
1. Retaliation/anger/spite	72.7	71.6	73.6	1.34 (0.02)	73.1	72.7	0.04 (-0.01)
2. To control the victim	71.6	72.6	70.8	0.99 (-0.02)	72.5	71.4	0.23 (-0.01)
3. The stalker was mentally ill or emotionally unstable	71.6	71.0	72.1	0.33 (0.01)	71.1	72.5	0.41 (0.01)
4. The stalker liked the victim or found the victim attractive	52.2	52.0	52.4	0.05 (0.01)	53.1	50.0	1.61 (-0.03)
5. To keep the victim in a relationship	48.1	47.7	48.4	0.12 (0.01)	49.1	46.9	0.81 (-0.02)
6. The stalker was a substance abuser	45.6	45.7	45.5	0.02 (-0.01)	45.8	45.8	0.00 (0.00)
7. The stalker liked the attention given by the victim	45.1	44.0	46.0	0.95 (0.02)	48.0	37.8	19.21 (-0.09) ***
8. The stalker had fantasy after witnessing the victim doing something	35.2	34.1	36.1	0.99 (0.02)	36.0	34.4	0.43 (-0.01)
9. The victim was a convenient/proximal target	26.8	24.1	29.0	7.62 (0.06) **	25.1	33.2	13.74 (0.08) ***
10. The stalker perceived the victim liked the attention	22.3	25.6	19.7	12.57 (-0.07) ***	23.8	18.3	7.35 (-0.06) **
11. No particular reason	15.1	16.2	14.3	1.76 (-0.03)	15.4	13.4	1.42 (-0.02)
12. The victim was from a different cultural belief or background	14.2	15.7	13.1	3.40 (-0.04) *	13.7	17.0	3.90 (0.04) *

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 4 Gender differences ($N = 2,496$) and differences in country of origin ($N = 2,392$) on perceived effective coping strategies for stalking victimization

Items ($\alpha = .79$ [male = .80, female = .76])	Perceived Effective Coping Strategies for Stalking Victimization (%)						
	Overall	Male	Female	χ^2 (Phi)	Hong Kong	Mainland China	χ^2 (Phi)
Moving inward items							
1. Seek meaning in context	74.9	74.6	75.1	0.10 (-0.01)	73.4	82.1	15.06 (-0.09) ***
2. Seek therapies	68.6	66.6	70.3	3.37 (-0.04) *	67.1	74.1	8.28 (-0.06) **
3. Minimize the problem in your (the victim's) own mind	66.7	63.0	69.9	11.52 (-0.07) **	64.7	76.7	23.48 (-0.11) ***
4. Ignore the problem	47.3	47.6	47.1	0.04 (0.01)	48.3	47.9	0.03 (0.01)
5. Seek meaning in general	35.7	37.4	34.3	2.20 (0.03)	34.0	39.1	4.27 (-0.05) *
6. Deny the problem	9.5	13.1	6.5	29.24 (0.12) ***	10.2	7.8	3.01 (0.04)
7. Blame yourself (the victim)	8.7	12.0	5.9	24.92 (0.11) ***	8.3	8.8	0.13 (-0.01)
8. Engage in self-destructive escapism	8.7	11.0	6.7	13.09 (0.08) ***	8.9	7.9	0.44 (0.01)
Moving outward items							
9. Engage in legal or law enforcement input	87.9	85.2	90.2	12.45 (-0.08) ***	87.0	90.9	5.36 (-0.05) *
10. Engage in direct involvement of others	78.1	74.4	81.2	14.30 (-0.08) ***	77.2	81.8	4.34 (-0.05) *
11. Engage in social support	62.5	59.7	64.8	5.79 (-0.05) *	58.8	73.9	34.96 (-0.13) ***
12. Engage in independent or private assistance	58.3	54.9	61.0	8.33 (-0.06) **	57.1	61.9	3.40 (-0.04) *
13. Seek sympathy from others	19.8	24.1	16.2	21.77 (0.10) ***	19.5	18.8	0.41 (0.01)
Moving away items							
14. Behave cautiously	79.7	76.7	82.2	10.33 (-0.07) **	79.0	81.9	1.91 (-0.03)
15. Distance yourself (the victim) from the stalker	79.3	74.0	83.8	31.63 (-0.12) ***	79.2	82.2	2.10 (-0.03)
16. Attempt to end the relationship	68.9	67.6	70.0	1.49 (-0.03)	69.1	67.9	0.23 (0.01)
17. Redirect or divert attention of the stalker	59.2	56.3	61.7	6.38 (-0.05) *	58.0	64.9	7.19 (-0.06) **
18. Control the interaction with the stalker	58.4	55.8	60.6	6.15 (0.05) *	59.1	56.2	1.52 (0.03)
19. Ignore the stalker's behavior	47.9	49.0	47.0	0.93 (0.02)	49.3	45.9	1.67 (0.03)
20. Block your (the victim) physical accessibility to the stalker	47.7	47.6	47.8	0.02 (-0.01)	45.7	54.0	9.99 (-0.07) **

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 4 cont.

Items	Perceived Effective Coping Strategies (%)						
	Overall	Male	Female	χ^2 (Phi)	Hong Kong	Mainland China	χ^2 (Phi)
21. Relocate to another physical location	39.6	36.4	42.3	7.85 (-0.06) **	38.4	44.1	4.95 (-0.05) *
22. Block your (the victim) electronic or media accessibility	34.2	34.5	34.0	1.25 (0.02)	31.9	39.3	9.03 (0.07) *
23. Use verbal “escape” tactics	34.0	34.4	33.7	1.34 (0.03)	35.4	29.0	9.94 (0.07) **
24. Restrict your (the victim) accessibility to the stalker	33.5	33.3	33.6	1.20 (0.02)	33.0	32.5	0.34 (0.01)
25. Detach or depersonalize	16.7	19.9	14.1	12.89 (0.08) ***	17.2	13.1	4.35 (0.05) *
Moving toward or with items							
26. Use problem solving negotiation with the stalker	65.9	64.5	67.1	1.52 (-0.03)	64.4	70.6	6.10 (-0.05) *
27. Negotiate relationship definition with the stalker	48.1	47.8	48.3	0.06 (-0.01)	46.7	53.5	6.81 (-0.06) **
28. Accept promises from the stalker	31.4	36.0	27.6	17.45 (0.09) ***	32.2	29.6	1.17 (0.02)
29. Deceive the stalker	29.4	36.3	23.7	40.90 (0.14) ***	29.4	28.8	0.08 (0.01)
30. Use nonverbal aggression against the stalker	24.3	31.0	18.6	45.65 (0.15) ***	22.2	30.5	13.65 (-0.08) ***
31. Bargain with the stalker	17.0	22.3	12.6	35.62 (0.13) ***	17.0	16.7	0.02 (0.01)
32. Diminish the seriousness of the situation	10.2	13.4	7.6	19.30 (0.09) ***	10.3	9.6	0.17 (0.01)
Moving against items							
33. Build a legal case against the stalker	85.2	79.3	90.1	50.69 (0.15) ***	84.8	86.7	1.20 (0.02)
34. Pursue a legal case against the stalker	81.3	76.3	85.5	29.50 (-0.12) ***	80.2	86.3	8.89 (-0.07) **
35. Use electronic protective responses	71.1	69.6	72.4	3.18 (0.04)	68.2	81.6	31.92 (-0.12) ***
36. Attempt to deter future behavior of the stalker	66.7	66.4	67.0	0.08 (-0.01)	68.0	64.8	1.66 (0.03)
37. Use protective responses to the stalker’s current behavior	61.3	60.2	62.2	0.87 (-0.02)	59.3	67.0	8.97 (-0.07) **
38. Issue verbal warnings or threats to the stalker	47.5	52.2	43.6	15.98 (0.09) ***	49.1	43.2	5.00 (0.05) *
39. Use electronic retaliatory responses	21.8	26.0	18.3	19.02 (0.09) ***	19.6	28.1	15.71 (-0.09) ***
40. Use physical violence against the stalker	15.3	22.1	9.6	64.81 (0.17) ***	14.6	18.0	3.19 (-0.04) *

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$