



THE ROLE OF FAMILY TYPE, BIRTH ORDER AND MODE OF TRANSPORTATIONS ON STALKING VICTIMIZATION AMONG FEMALE COLLEGE STUDENTS IN INDIAN CONTEXT

S. Kalaivanan* & Dr. J. M. Asgarali Patel**

* Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar, Tamil Nadu

** Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar, Tamil Nadu

Cite This Article: S. Kalaivanan & Dr. J. M. Asgarali Patel, "The Role of Family Type, Birth Order and Mode of Transportations on Stalking Victimization among Female College Students in Indian Context", International Journal of Applied and Advanced Scientific Research, Volume 1, Issue 1, Page Number 248-251, 2016

Abstract:

This research study is an attempt made to assess the influence of three demographic variables, Family Type, Birth order and Mode of Transportations on the stalking victimization among female college students in Indian context. The sample-size for this study comprised of randomly selected 1000 female college students from three different streams- Professional (N=400), Arts (N=300), and Science (N=300), from Annamalai University (Asia's largest residential university) in Chidambaram, Tamil Nadu. The age range of the participants in this study was from 17 to 30 years (Mean age= 23.5 years). Tools used for data collection were; (1) stalking behaviour checklist by Coleman (1997) a standardized instrument selected after a comprehensive review of related literature, and (2) the Personal Information Schedule designed by the researcher to procure relevant demographic information. The informants were contacted individually by the researchers and data was obtained through face-to-face personal interview. The Mean, Standard Deviation, Standard Error, 't' test and ANOVA were the statistical analysis done. Results indicated that all the three demographic variables, explicitly, Family Type, Birth order and Mode of Transportations, were there is no significant influences on stalking victimization among female college students.

Introduction:

Throughout history the prevalence of discrimination, violence and harassment against the softer sex has been a global phenomenon. Presently, despite women representing about half the world's populace, the gender-based harassment is a widespread realism in the lives of most women from both developed and developing nations. Though different forms of harassment prevailing against women have been scientifically documented, in general, mainly young women are relatively more prone to become victims of sexual harassment and stalking. Currently, empirical literature reveals that comparatively studies on sexual harassment appear vast, while the status of research on stalking seems emerging.

The bustle of stalking is traced to the period of antiquity. The records of both romantic literary contributions and historical traditions are replete with evidences on the obsessive pursuit of another person, whether for purposes of romance or revenge (e.g., Kamir, (1995); Lloyd-Goldstein, (1998). According to the Oxford English Dictionary the term "stalker" has been used since the 16th century to refer to a "prowler" or a "poacher." However the term 'stalker' became popular in the 20th century only after media began to use it to portray "strangers who obsessively harass other."

Stalking was not a crime until 1990 and it was during this period the 1st anti-stalking legislation was implemented in California. Stalking initially engrossed extensive mass apprehension by the killing of a young actress Rebecca Shaeffer, in California, by an obsessed fan who had stalked her for two years. This upheaval got large media attention and exposed the serious consequences of stalking to both celebrity and non-celebrity victims. Subsequently, nowadays stalking is recognized as a crime in many countries. In recent years, stalking has been considered as an important social and legal problem (Williams, Frieze, & Sinclair, (2007).

Demographic information is cumulative and probabilistic information concerning various groups and demographic profiling is in essence an effort in making generalizations on diverse groups. Research studies on stalking victimization accentuating the importance of various demographic variables are prolific. Overall, research investigations vastly illustrate there is no significant influences on stalking victimization among female college students in Indian context.

Significance of the Present Study:

In the present global scenario, the intense detrimental corollaries of stalking have surfaced as a prime apprehension of community health. Of late many nations have proclaimed stalking as a punishable offense and has enacted strict laws to deal with it. However scientifically very less is known about prevalence, causes, methods, consequences, of stalking. The overall empirical literature on stalking appears fragmented and the research on stalking is still in an embryonic phase. The International research community instigated to probe into the issue of stalking only during the preceding decade. In India the awareness on stalking among the lay public is remote, mostly it is confused with Eve-teasing. The Indian research fraternity is hitherto not notably dealt with research on stalking. The review of literature leads to the conclusion that research on stalking in

Indian context is inadequate. There is a total dearth on empirical data on stalking pertaining to the Indian context. The outcomes of this study would assuage the paucity in empirical data pertaining to stalking in India. This study will uncover the demographic issues involved in stalking which would benefit the policy makers, law enforcers, academicians, educators, and public in general are dormant about stalking and related phenomena.

Method:

Sample:

The sample-size for this study comprised of randomly selected 1000 female college students from three different streams- Professional (N= 400), Arts (N= 300), and Science (N= 300), from Annamalai University (Asia's largest residential university) in Chidambaram, Tamilnadu. All the respondents were between the age group of 17 to 30 years (Mean age= 23.5 years). The sample selection for this study was mainly from educational institutions.

Tools Used:

The research tools used in this study for data collection were the; (1) Stalking Behaviour Checklist and (2) Personal Information Schedule.

Stalking Behaviour Checklist:

This tool was developed by Coleman (1997). This checklist consists of 25 items which are grouped under two subscales, namely, (1) violent behaviour scale with 12 items from serial numbers from 1 to 12, and the (2) harassing behaviour scale with 13 items from serial numbers from 13 to 25. All the items in this checklist are rated on a 6-point scale. Higher scores are indicative of greater levels of violent and harassing behaviors.

Personal Information Schedule:

The personal information schedule was designed by the investigator of the present research to procure relevant demographic information from the respondents pertaining to this study.

The primary method of data collection was adopted in this study. The informants were contacted individually by the researcher.

Statistical Analysis:

The statistical package for social science (SPSS) was used to analyze the data. The Mean, Standard Deviation, Standard Error, 't' test, ANOVA and Post-hoc were the statistical analysis done.

Results and Discussion:

The present research investigated the influence of three demographic variables upon stalking victimization of female university students. The results summarized in table I point out that type of family is not significantly in influencing the stalking victimization among female college students.

From the table I It is observed that the type of family (joint/ nuclear) significantly influence the female students stalking behaviour ($t=2.39$, $p<0.05$). the mean score of above mentioned table 1 for stalking behaviour among female students who are living with joint family facing highest stalking behaviour (.40), followed by female students who are living in nuclear family (.32) was found to be least. Variable of type of family were as does not significantly influence other sub-variables of violence against women namely, More than one Occasion ($t=0.94$, NS), Very frightened / Feared (1.45, NS), bodily harm to them/someone close to them ($t=.17$, NS) and violence against women ($t=.27$, NS). This result summarized that conclusion table 1 it is inferred that female students significantly influenced only one variable, namely, stalking behaviour by the type of family (joint/ nuclear). The other variables namely, (More than one Occasion, Bodily harm to them/ someone close to them and violence against women) are found that female students were not significantly influenced by type of family. Hence the formulated hypothesis that "Violence against women is influenced by the type of family (joint family/ nuclear family) of female students" Is rejected.

The results are summarized in table 2. Indicates that birth order is significant in influencing 2 variables, namely, Bodily harm to them/ someone close to them ($F=3.07$, $p<0.05$) and violence against women ($F=3.78$, $p<0.05$). The other 3 variables Stalking Behaviours ($F=1.83$, NS), More than one Occasion (2.12) and very frightened/feared ($F=1.97$, NS) are not significant. The hypothesis that, "Violence against women is influenced by the birth order of female students." is not confirmed by the outcomes of this present research. It is observed from the mean scores in table 2 for Bodily harm to them/ someone close to them of female students that middle born female students (.18) are high in their facing problem bodily harm/someone close to them, than the later born female students (.14) and the first born female students (.11) are found to be least. The mean scores for violence against women of female students indicates that middle born female students (1.16), subsequently the later born female students (1.12) and next by female students who were first born (1.09). Hence from table 2 it is inferred that female students significantly differ 2 variables, namely, (Bodily harm to them/ someone close to them and violence against women) in their violent against women on the basis of their birth order but they do not differ in their other 3 variables, Stalking Behaviours, More than one Occasion and very frightened/feared.

Table.3 indicates that the mode of transportation of female students (walk, 2 wheeler, 4 wheeler, bus/train) significantly influence their violent behaviour ($F= 7.99, p<0.05$), the other variable of harassing behaviour ($F= 2.66, NS$) not significant. It is observed from the mean scores in table 3 for violent behaviour of female students that 4 wheeler (1.53) are highly facing in their violent behaviour than the 2 wheeler (1.29) and by walk (1.15), bus/train(1.15) both was found to be least. Hence, the results in above table point out those two variables, namely, (violent behaviour, harassing behaviour) violent behaviour are significantly influenced by the mode of transportation of female students. This study partially confirms the hypothesis “Mode of transportation influences stalking victimization of female students.”

References:

1. Basile, K., Swahn, M., Chen, J., & Saltzman, L., (2006). Stalking in the United States: Recent national prevalence estimates. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 31, 2, 172-175.
2. Jaishankar Karuppannan, Kosalai Puthisigamani (2007). Victims of stalking in India: A study of girl college students in Tirunelveli City, Temida, 10(4), 13-21, doi:10.2298/TEM0704013J.
3. Kamir, O. (1995). Stalking: History, Culture and law. SJD dissertation. University of Michigan Law School, Ann Arbor.
4. Lloyd-Goldstein, R. (1998). De Clérembault on-line: A survey of erotomania and stalking from the old world to the World Wide Web. In J. R. Meloy (Ed.), *The psychology of stalking: Clinical and forensic perspectives*. San Diego: Academic Press.
5. Purcell, R., Pathe, M., & Mullen, P. E. (2005). Association between stalking victimisation and psychiatric morbidity in a random community sample. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 187, 416-420.
6. Spitzberg, B. H., & Hoobler, G. (2002). Cyberstalking and the technologies of interpersonal terrorism. *New Media & Society*, 4, 71-92.
7. Way, R. C. (1994). The criminalization of stalking: an exercise in media manipulation and political opportunism. *McGill Law Journal*, 39, 379 – 400.
8. Williams, S. L., Frieze, I. H. and Sinclair, H. C. (2007). “Stalking and intimate violence”. In *Family therapy for domestic violence: A practitioner's guide to gender-inclusive research and treatment*, Edited by: Hamel, J. and Nicholls, T. 109–123. New York: Springer Publishing.

Table 1: Showing the mean, SD, SE_M , and t-value for different type of family of female students for their stalking victimization

Variables	Type of Family	N	Mean	SD	SE_M	t-value	L.S
Violent Behaviour	Joint	246	1.24	0.566	0.036	2.19*	0.05
	Nuclear	754	1.17	0.431	0.015		
Harassing Behaviour	Joint	246	1.37	0.73	0.046	0.93	NS
	Nuclear	754	1.31	0.8	0.029		

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 2: Showing the mean, SD, SE_M , and F-ratio for birth order of female students for their stalking victimization.

Variables	Birth Order	N	Mean	SD	SE_M	F-value	L.S
Violent Behaviour	First Born	462	1.13	0.368	0.017	7.52*	0.05
	Second Born	308	1.26	0.55	0.031		
	Later Born	230	1.2	0.514	0.033		
	Total	1000	1.18	0.468	0.014		
Harassing Behaviour	First Born	462	1.27	0.704	0.032	2.84	N.S
	Second Born	308	1.4	0.948	0.054		
	Later Born	230	1.34	0.677	0.044		
	Total	1000	1.32	0.783	0.024		

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 3: Showing the mean, SD, SEM, and F-ratio for mode of transportation of Female students for their stalking victimization

Variables	Mode of Transportation	N	Mean	SD	SE_M	F-Value	L.S
Violent Behaviour	Walk	394	1.15	0.411	0.02	7.99*	0.05
	2 Wheeler	195	1.29	0.607	0.043		
	4 Wheeler	17	1.53	1.09	0.266		
	Bus-Train	394	1.15	0.381	0.019		

	Total	1000	1.18	0.468	0.014		
Harassing Behaviour	Walk	394	1.27	0.547	0.027	2.66	N.S
	2 Wheeler	195	1.45	0.767	0.054		
	4 Wheeler	17	1.5	0.866	0.21		
	Bus-Train	394	1.31	0.963	0.048		
	Total	1000	1.32	0.783	0.024		

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.