

REJECTION SENSITIVITY, EMPATHY, AND ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

by

SAMANTHA MARIE MASTROIANNI

Submitted to the Psychology Department
School of Natural and Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Bachelor of Arts

Purchase College
State University of New York

December 2019

Sponsor: Yanine Hess, Ph.D.

Second Reader: Jacqueline Fisher, Ph.D.

Abstract

Is there any connection between sensitivity to rejection and empathy? Previous research has shown that high levels of rejection sensitivity can lead to issues in forming and maintaining healthy romantic relationships. Empathy, on the other hand, has been found to improve relationship quality and lead to less destructive behaviors in relationships. The primary goal of this study was to find the correlation, if any, between rejection sensitivity and empathy. Such a link may provide insight into why highly rejection-sensitive people often encounter issues in their romantic relationships. Reasoning that the relationship issues faced by those with high levels of rejection sensitivity may be due to a low level of trait empathy, we hypothesized that there would be a negative correlation between rejection sensitivity and trait empathy. The findings from this study did not support this hypothesis, as we instead found a positive correlation between rejection sensitivity and trait empathy. However, when each subscale of empathy was examined, it was found that this relationship was entirely driven by a positive correlation between the personal distress subscale and rejection sensitivity. Therefore, findings of this study suggest that those who are highly rejection-sensitive also experience high levels of personal distress empathy. This personal distress could be a possible reason for the relationship difficulties faced by those who are rejection sensitive.

Keywords: rejection-sensitivity, empathy

Rejection Sensitivity and Empathy

Humans have a broad range of emotions and reactions to interpersonal interactions. These reactions can range from inconsequential to overwhelmingly detrimental, as each person is unique. Due to our uniqueness, there are many possible interpretations people can have of similar situations. One situation that often provokes negative reactions is rejection. Rejection occurs when an individual is denied what they desire. Although many of us dread rejection, those who are highly rejection-sensitive are more affected by it than others. Those who are highly rejection-sensitive “anxiously expect, readily perceive, and overreact to rejection” (Downey & Feldman, 1996, p. 1327).

The only assessment designed to measure levels of rejection sensitivity is the Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire. (RSQ; Downey & Feldman, 1996) This contains interpersonal situations that use a Likert scale to measure participants’ levels of anxiety and their expectation of rejection in each scenario. These situations are each unique, and they each consist of something that may make someone feel vulnerable, such as asking one’s parents for money or approaching a close friend after a big fight. While answering the questionnaire, people rate their level of anxiety and concern. One would stand out as highly rejection-sensitive if they indicate both a high level of concern and a low expectation of acceptance resulting from each proposition.

Rejection sensitivity has been found to have negative implications for relationships. Rejection sensitivity often leads to difficulties in romantic relationships for both the partner who is highly rejection sensitive as well as their partner. Downey and Feldman (1996) found that rejection-sensitive individuals in a relationship feel an internal struggle that can sometimes cause frustration in their partner who is not rejection-sensitive. They found that high levels of rejection sensitivity can lead to feelings of insecurity and dissatisfaction with one’s relationship, as well as

an exaggeration of partners' dissatisfaction and desire to leave the relationship. In addition, they found that the partners of those who were rejection sensitive reported their relationship as less satisfying than those whose partners were not rejection sensitive. Specifically, women with rejection-sensitive partners reported dissatisfaction based on their partners' jealous and controlling behavior, while men with rejection-sensitive partners reported dissatisfaction based on their partners' hostility and diminished emotional support. Downey et al (1998) found that those with high levels of rejection sensitivity tend to have more breakups than those with low levels of rejection sensitivity. They also found that highly rejection-sensitive women tend to behave more negatively towards their partners than women who were not high in rejection sensitivity during conflict. In addition, they found that the partners of these highly rejection-sensitive women were more negatively affected by conflicts and reported more dissatisfaction and thoughts of ending their relationships than the partners of women with low levels of rejection sensitivity.

Rejection sensitivity can also lead to dissatisfaction with romantic relationships. Norona and Welsh (2016) found that rejection sensitivity is negatively associated with relationship satisfaction, and that emotional cutoff mediates this. In other words, those who are highly rejection sensitive tend to hold back emotionally from their partners, which can lead to a decrease in relationship satisfaction. Galliher and Bentley (2010) found that males' high rejection sensitivity levels were linked to less relationship satisfaction from both themselves and their partners. They also found that males' high rejection sensitivity levels were linked to self-reported and partner-reported aggressive behavior, as well as perpetration and victimization, which was reported by their girlfriends. Finally, they found that females with high levels of rejection sensitivity self-reported low relationship satisfaction. Additionally, Norona et al. (2018)

found that rejection sensitivity in high school students predicted a lower likelihood of involvement in longer relationships, predicted more secrecy from partners, and a shorter duration of one's longest relationship. They also found that increases in rejection sensitivity predicted less romantic certainty, less perceived romantic partner support, as well as less growth following romantic stress.

Those who are rejection sensitive often perceive rejection and negative motivations from romantic partners' actions when it may not be their partners' intention. For example, Downey and Feldman (1996) found that high rejection sensitivity levels predicted the extent to which people attributed hurtful intent to their romantic partner's insensitive behavior. Schoebi, Perrez, and Bradbury (2012) found that those who are highly rejection sensitive are less likely to associate their partners positive moods with themselves or with their relationship, compared to those who were not high in rejection sensitivity. Those with low levels, instead, attributed their partners' positive moods to their relationship and themselves. Therefore, those who are rejection sensitive seem to be so focused on rejection to the extent that they perceive more negativity and harmful intent in relationships than is there, or they have trouble associating positivity with themselves or their relationships.

Previous research has found that high rejection sensitivity may also lead to violence in relationships. Downey, Feldman, and Ayduk (2000) found that specifically for men who are highly invested in their romantic relationships, rejection sensitivity can predict dating violence. They also found that for men who have low investment in their romantic relationships, rejection sensitivity predicted lower levels of involvement in close romantic relationships, as well as more distress during and avoidance of social situations. Therefore, dating violence can be an issue for men who are highly rejection sensitive, specifically if they are also invested in their romantic

relationships. Göncü and Sümer (2011) found that when highly rejection sensitive individuals attribute negative intent to their partners' behaviors, this can lead to violence towards their partners. Therefore, misinterpreted negative intent that tends to be an issue for those who are highly rejection sensitive may also lead to relationship violence.

Although considerable research demonstrates the link between rejection sensitivity and negative relationship outcomes, it is unclear what processes or factors are involved. One possibility is that rejection sensitivity has implications for individuals' levels of empathy. Empathy is our ability to feel another's pain and look at situations from a different perspective than our own.

One's ability to empathize with another person tends to lead to more prosocial behavior (Taylor, Eisenberg, Spinrad, Eggum, & Sulik, 2013). Higher levels of empathy can also lead to a better ability to deal with conflict in a prosocial way (Ulloa et al, 2017). Empathy is correlated with likeability and friendliness, while a lack of empathy is correlated with aloofness, as well as hostile, cold, and insensitive feelings towards others (Hogan, 1969). Empathy also leads to more social acceptance (Mast, Hall, & Jonas, 2009). Miller and Eisenberg (1988) found that empathy is negatively related to aggression, as well as externalizing and antisocial behaviors, and enactment and receipt of physical abuse.

Empathy has positive effects on romantic relationships. Sened, et al (2017) found that empathic accuracy is positively associated with relationship satisfaction. Specifically, they found that the ability to perceive and empathize with one's partner's negative emotions is more beneficial to the relationship than recognizing and empathizing with positive emotions. Empathy towards one's partner is related to higher relationship satisfaction. (Perrone-McGovern, et al.,

2014). Empathy is also related to better self-perceived relationship quality in both men and women, and more empathy specifically in women is related to their partner's perceptions of better relationship quality (Ulloa et al., 2017).

The relationship between rejection sensitivity and empathy has not yet been directly examined, though we can observe differences between rejection sensitivity and empathy. For example, empathy has been linked with possessing a positive view of oneself, while those with low self-esteem tend to keep an anxious lookout for any possible rejections (Sakellaropoulo & Baldwin, 2006). In addition, McCullough et al. (1998) found that empathy is associated with a reduction in destructive behaviors in romantic relationships including avoidance and revenge. In contrast, rejection sensitivity has been found to possibly trigger destructive behaviors such as hostility, lack of emotional support, and jealousy in relationships. (Downey & Feldman, 1996). Empathy is linked to greater forgiveness, (McCullough et al., 1998), while rejection sensitivity is correlated with increased romantic relationship issues (Downey & Feldman, 1996; Norona et al. 2018). Empathy towards one's partner has also been linked to more effective problem-solving approaches, (Perrone-McGovern et al., 2014), which would be especially useful when dealing with issues in romantic relationships. These differences inspired the hypothesis of the current study.

The Current Study

In the current study, the association between rejection sensitivity and empathy was examined. This link was examined by having participants complete measures of rejection sensitivity and trait empathy. It was hypothesized that rejection sensitivity would negatively correlate with trait empathy. If this hypothesis is supported, it will not be possible to understand the directionality of the correlation, as this is a cross-sectional study. Therefore, it may be that an

initial lack of trait empathy that leads to high rejection sensitivity, or that higher rejection sensitivity leads to lower levels of empathy. Although this directionality will not be determined in this study, the findings will be helpful for possible intervention for those displaying both high rejection sensitivity and low empathy.

Method

Participants

In this study, 475 participants (58.9% male, 40.2% female, and .8% who preferred to indicate another gender) were recruited from the Purchase College Psychology Pool as well as from Amazon's Mechanical Turk. Participants' ages ranged from 18-99 ($M = 33.26$, $SD = 11.69$). Ethnicities of participants included 66.3% White or Caucasian, 17.5% African American or Black, 8.4% Latinx or Hispanic, 5.3% Asian or Pacific Islander, 1.5% multiracial, .8% East Asian or Indian, and .2% who preferred to indicate another ethnicity. Participants from the Purchase College Psychology Pool were compensated with one credit for their Introduction to Psychology course. Participants from Amazon's Mechanical Turk were compensated with \$2.00.

Materials

Rejection Sensitivity. Participants completed the Adult Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire (Berenson et al, 2013). This included nine interpersonal situations that questioned participants about their anxiety and anticipation of rejection in each scenario. Participants rated their level of anxiety and concern about the situation on a scale from 1 (Very unconcerned) to 6 (Very concerned), as well as their expectations of acceptance in the situation from 1 (Very unlikely) to 6 (Very concerned). One example situation was: "You ask your parents or another family member for a loan to help you through a difficult financial time." Each situation's concern score was multiplied by its reverse-coded acceptance-expectation score. The final

situation scores were then averaged together, such that the higher averages indicated more rejection sensitivity.

Empathy. Participants completed the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Davis, 1980, 1983). This measure of trait empathy included 28 items measuring four different subsections of empathy: perspective-taking, empathic concern, personal distress, and fantasy. (Fantasy scale responses were omitted for reasons of both time and relevance). Participants indicated their connection to each item on five-point Likert-type scales, from A (Does not describe me very well), to E, (Describes me very well). Some of these statements were scored negatively and reverse coded, such as: “I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the “other guy’s” point of view,” while others were scored positively, such as, “I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me.” Higher averages on each of the subscales indicated greater empathy.

Procedure

Participants could participate in this study on any computer or cell phone with internet access, on their own time. Most participants (84.21%) used Amazon’s Mechanical Turk to participate, while others (15.79%) used a link they found on Purchase College’s Psychology Participant Pool.

After providing their informed consent, participants completed the Hypothetical Ambiguous Situation Questionnaire for another researcher’s study (Appendix A). Next, participants completed the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Davis, 1980, 1983; Appendix B). Following this, participants completed the Adult Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire. (Berenson et al, 2013; Appendix C). For another researcher’s study, participants also completed the Big Five Personality Questionnaire. (John & Srivastava, 1999; Appendix D). Participants were then

asked to provide demographic information including gender, age, and ethnicity. Finally, participants received debriefing statements that described the purpose of the study.

Results

The correlation between rejection sensitivity and overall trait empathy yielded a positive correlation between rejection sensitivity and empathy. See Table 1 for all correlations. This is the opposite of what was hypothesized, which was that rejection sensitivity would negatively correlate with trait empathy.

As post hoc analysis, correlations were also conducted between rejection sensitivity and each subscale of empathy. The first of these was the correlation between rejection sensitivity and perspective- taking empathy, which yielded a non-significant, negative correlation (see Table 1). The correlation between rejection sensitivity and empathic concern was again non-significant. Finally, there was a positive and significant correlation between rejection sensitivity and personal distress (See Table 1).

Discussion

The hypothesis of this study was that rejection sensitivity would negatively correlate with empathy. This was hypothesized because of differences between rejection sensitivity and empathy, specifically in their impacts on romantic relationships. Empathy tends to have a positive effect on romantic relationships, while rejection sensitivity tends to have a negative effect. The opposite of our hypothesis was found instead, as there was a significant positive correlation between rejection sensitivity and empathy. However, when each level of empathy was examined in relation to rejection sensitivity, the only positive correlation was between rejection sensitivity and personal distress empathy. The other two subscales of empathy had no correlations with rejection sensitivity.

Although the results of this study did not support the hypothesis, they are interesting. Personal distress was the only subscale of empathy that was positively correlated with rejection sensitivity. It was also the only subscale that was self-focused, rather than focused on others, with examples such as, “In emergency situations, I feel apprehensive and ill-at-ease,” and “When I see someone who badly needs help in an emergency, I go to pieces.” This was the most self-involved level of empathy, and those who are high in rejection sensitivity may be more focused on themselves during interactions in the first place. Previous research has also shown perspective taking and personal distress as negatively correlated (Davis, 1980), which may account for why there was such a difference among the subscales of empathy and their interactions with rejection sensitivity. Although this research found a positive association between rejection sensitivity and empathy, this may be unique to the specific personal distress measure and not truly reflective of what researchers often conceptualize as empathy.

Limitations

There were multiple limitations to the current study. One possible limitation of this study was the lack of current-state measures. There was no measure of current emotions and feelings before the study began. Some participants could possibly have been experiencing negative emotions or could have just finished a negative interpersonal interaction that could have had an impact on that participants’ responses. This could possibly skew the results to be more negative, or positive, due to current emotions, as there was no way to control for current emotion. If repeated, this study should include a measure of current mood.

Another limitation of this study was possible subject fatigue. All subjects took all the questionnaires which consisted of simply reading and checking boxes on their computers. This may have led to boredom or frustration in participants, which could possibly have led them to

randomly click just to get through the questions. We did not include a check for attention, which could have shown us if this was happening. In addition, we did not include a timer on the questionnaires, so we could not tell if participants were quickly clicking through the questions or taking their time.

Another limitation of this study was the fact that the measure of empathy used in this study included the self-focused subscale of personal distress. There are other measures of empathy, and another measure might yield a different correlation between trait empathy and rejection sensitivity. Those who are highly rejection-sensitive may be self-focused in the first place and unable to separate their own negative feelings from another's, which may explain our findings.

Future Directions

The findings from this study fail to show a connection between rejection sensitivity and other aspects of empathy, such as emotional concern or perspective-taking. This may suggest that deficits in empathy may not have much to do with the interpersonal issues that result from rejection sensitivity. However, it is also possible that higher levels of personal distress could explain some of these negative relationship behaviors. Future research should examine the relationship between rejection sensitivity and personal distress more closely and try to figure out exactly what this connection means and where it comes from. Previous research has found that empathy develops during toddler years, and then tends to stabilize (Taylor, Eisenberg, Spinrad, Eggum, & Sulik, 2013). Future research should try to find out when and how each subscale develops and what leads to stronger levels of each. This information may help explain the connection found in this study between personal distress and rejection sensitivity. There may be some negative life event or series of events during early years of life that trigger higher levels of

this self-involved subscale of empathy, and this may have some connection to the development of rejection sensitivity.

References

- Berenson, K. R., Gyurak, A., Downey, G., Ayduk, O., Mogg, K., Bradley, B., & Pine, D. (2013). Rejection Sensitivity RS-Adult questionnaire (A-RSQ). Measurement Instrument Database for the Social Science. Retrieved from www.midss.ie.
- Bernstein, M.J. & Benfield, J.A. (2013). Past perspective is related to present relationships: Past-positive and negative time perspectives differentially predict rejection sensitivity. *The Psychological Record*, 63, 615-628.
- Davis, M.H. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. *JSAS Catalogue of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 10, 85.
- Davis, M.H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 113-126.
- Downey, G. & Feldman, S.I. (1996). Implications of rejection sensitivity for intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(6), 1327-1343.
- Downey, G., Feldman, S., Ayduk, O. (2000). Rejection sensitivity and male violence in romantic relationships. *Personal Relationships*, 7, 45-61.
- Downey, G., Freitas, A.L, Michaelis, B., & Khouri, H. (1998). The self-fulfilling prophecy in close relationships: Rejection sensitivity and rejection by romantic partners. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75(2), 545-560.
- Göncü, A. & Sümer, N. (2011). Rejection sensitivity, self-esteem instability, and relationship outcomes: The mediating role of responsibility attributions. *European Psychologist*, 16(4), 303-313.
- Hogan, R. (1969). Development of an empathy scale. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 33(3), 307-316.

- John, O.P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L.A. Pervin & O.P. Johns (Eds), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, 2, 102-138.
- Mast, M.S., Jonas, K., & Hall, J. (2009). Give a person power and he or she will show interpersonal sensitivity: The phenomenon is why and when. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(5), 835-850.
- McCullough, M.E., Rachal, K.C., Sandage, S.J, Worthington, E.L., Brown, S.W., & Hight, T.L. (1998). Interpersonal forgiving in close relationships: II. Theoretical elaboration and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75(6), 1586-1603.
- Miller, P.A. & Eisenberg, N. (1988). The relation of empathy to aggressive and externalizing / antisocial behavior. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103(3), 324-344.
- Norona, J.C., Tregubenko, V., Boiangiu, S.B., Levy, G. Scharf, M., Welsh, D.P., Shulman, S. (2018). Changes in rejection sensitivity across adolescence and emerging adulthood: Associations with relationship involvement, quality, and coping. *Journal of Adolescence*, 63, 96-106.
- Norona, J.C. & Welsh, D.P. (2016). Rejection sensitivity and relationship satisfaction in dating relationships: The mediating role of differentiation of self. *Couple and Family Psychology: Research and Practice*, 5(2), 124-135.
- Perrone-McGovern, K.M., Oliveira-Silva, P., Simon-Dack, S., Lefdahl-Davis, E., Adams, D., McConnell, J., ... Goncalves, O.F. (2014). Effects of empathy and conflict resolution strategies on psychophysiological arousal and satisfaction in romantic relationships. *Applied Psychophysiology and Biofeedback*, 39, 19-25.

- Sakellaropoulo, M., Baldwin, M.W. (2006). Interpersonal cognition and the relational self: Paving the empirical road for dialogical science. *International Journal for Dialogical Science, 1*(1), 47-66.
- Sened, H., Lavidó, M., Lazarus, G., Bar-Kalifa, E., Rafaeli, E. (2017). Empathic accuracy and relationship satisfaction: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Family Psychology, 31*(6). 742-752.
- Schoebi, D., Perrez, M., Bradbury, T.N. (2012). Expectancy effects on marital interaction: Rejection sensitivity as a critical moderator. *Journal of Family Psychology, 26*(5). 709-718.
- Taylor, Z.E., Eisenberg, N., Spinrad, T.L., Eggum, N.D., Sulik, M.J. (2013). The relations of ego-resiliency and emotional socialization to the development of empathy and prosocial behavior across early childhood. *Emotion 13*(5), 822-831.
- Ulloa, E.C., Hammett, J.F., Meda, N.A., & Rubalcaba, S.J. (2017). Empathy and romantic relationship quality among cohabitating couples: An actor-partner interdependence model. *The Family Journal, 25*(3), 208-214.

Table 1. Correlation Table

	Rejection Sensitivity
Rejection Sensitivity	
Average	.300*
Empathy	
EC Empathy	-.039**
PT Empathy	-.003**
PD Empathy	.348*

Table 1 Notes. N = 475. * = $p < .001$, ** = $p > .05$. EC Empathy = Empathic Concern; PT Empathy = Perspective Taking; PD Empathy = Personal Distress.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha
Rejection Sensitivity	1.00	36.00	17.86	6.51	.91
Average Empathy	1.00	5.00	3.08	.69	.80
EC Empathy	1.00	5.00	3.75	.91	.88
PT Empathy	1.00	5.00	3.77	.74	.81
PD Empathy	1.00	5.00	2.75	.95	.87

Table 2 Notes. EC Empathy = Empathic Concern; PT Empathy = Perspective Taking; PD Empathy = Personal Distress.

Appendix A: Hypothetical Ambiguous Situation Questionnaire

Instructions: For this part of the study, you will be provided with five situations and asked to think about how the individual in the situation may be feeling on a scale from 1, “Extremely unlikely” to 7, “Extremely likely.” There are no right or wrong answers; we are simply interested in your perceptions of these situations.

- 1) Everyone gathers in the cafeteria for lunch after work. You and a group of your coworkers are sitting together at the table, and you notice that the new employee is sitting alone.

To what extent do you think the new employee feels:

1. Lonely
2. Sad
3. Hurt
4. Anxious
5. Peaceful
6. Independent
7. Confident
8. Indifferent

- 2) Your friend calls you to tell you how excited they are about their 1 year anniversary with their spouse. Later that day, you congratulate their spouse after bumping into them at the gas station. They look puzzled and you remind them of the anniversary.

If your friend were to find out that their spouse forgot, to what extent do you think they would feel:

1. Lonely

2. Sad
3. Hurt
4. Anxious
5. Peaceful
6. Independent
7. Confident
8. Indifferent

- 3) You just won the championship for your intramural baseball game. After the game ends, everyone celebrates and joins their family in the stands. When you ask one of your teammates where their family is, they shrug. Their family is not there.

Considering this, to what extent do you think your teammate would feel:

1. Lonely
2. Sad
3. Hurt
4. Peaceful
5. Anxious
6. Independent
7. Confident
8. Indifferent

- 4) Your coworker explains that they are worried about their evaluation. They work very hard, but with other responsibilities and problems at home, they do not believe they have been doing their best at work. When they check online, they have an email summarizing a negative evaluation of their work.

Considering this, to what extent do you think your coworker would feel:

1. Lonely
 2. Sad
 3. Hurt
 4. Peaceful
 5. Anxious
 6. Independent
 7. Confident
 8. Indifferent
- 5) You arrive home and notice that your father looks distressed. When you ask him what is wrong, he explains that he is trying to figure out how to pay all of the family bills and expenses. He says that he is having a difficult time because of financial issues. He says that even though he works long hours he feels that he isn't getting paid enough and wishes he had taken up a different career.

To what extent do you think your father would feel...

1. Lonely
2. Sad
3. Hurt
4. Peaceful
5. Anxious
6. Independent
7. Confident
8. Indifferent

Appendix B: Interpersonal Reactivity Index

INTERPERSONAL REACTIVITY INDEX

The following statements inquire about your thoughts and feelings in a variety of situations. For each item, indicate how well it describes you by choosing the appropriate letter on the scale: A, B, C, D, or E. READ EACH ITEM CAREFULLY BEFORE RESPONDING. Answer as honestly as you can. Thank you.

ANSWER SCALE:

A	B	C	D	E
DOES NOT				DESCRIBES ME
DESCRIBE ME				VERY
WELL				WELL

1. I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me. (EC)
2. I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the “other guy’s” point of view. (PT) (-)
3. Sometimes I don’t feel very sorry for other people when they are having problems. (EC) (-)
4. In emergency situations, I feel apprehensive and ill-at-ease. (PD)
5. I try to look at everybody’s side of a disagreement before I make a decision. (PT)
6. When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards them. (EC)
7. I sometimes feel helpless when I am in the middle of a very emotional situation. (PD)
8. I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective. (PT)
9. When I see someone get hurt, I tend to remain calm. (PD) (-)
10. Other people’s misfortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal. (EC) (-)
11. If I’m sure I’m right about something, I don’t waste much time listening to other people’s arguments. (PT) (-)
12. Being in a tense emotional situation scares me. (PD)
13. When I see someone being treated unfairly, I sometimes don’t feel very much pity for them. (EC) (-)
14. I am usually pretty effective in dealing with emergencies. (PD) (-)
15. I am often quite touched by things that I see happen. (EC)

16. I believe that there are two sides to every question and try to look at them both. (PT)
17. I would describe myself as a pretty soft-hearted person. (EC)
18. I tend to lose control during emergencies. (PD)
19. When I'm upset at someone, I usually try to "put myself in his shoes" for a while. (PT)
20. When I see someone who badly needs help in an emergency, I go to pieces. (PD)
21. Before criticizing somebody, I try to imagine how I would feel if I were in their place. (PT)

NOTE:(-) denotes item to be scored in reverse fashion

PT = perspective-taking scale

FS = fantasy scale

EC = empathic concern scale

PD = personal distress scale

A = 0

B = 1

C = 2

D = 3

E = 4

Except for reversed-scored items, which are scored:

A = 4

B = 3

C = 2

D = 1

E = 0

Appendix C: Adult Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire

The items below describe situations in which people sometimes ask things of others.

For each item, imagine that you are in the situation, and then answer the questions that follow it.

1. You ask your parents or another family member for a loan to help you through a difficult financial time.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your family would want to help you?	very unconcerned					very concerned
	1	2	3	4	5	6
I would expect that they would agree to help as much as they can.	very unlikely					very likely
	1	2	3	4	5	6

2. You approach a close friend to talk after doing or saying something that seriously upset him/her.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your friend would want to talk with you?	very unconcerned					very concerned
	1	2	3	4	5	6
I would expect that he/she would want to talk with me to try to work things out.	very unlikely					very likely
	1	2	3	4	5	6

3. You bring up the issue of sexual protection with your significant other and tell him/her how important you think it is.

How concerned or anxious would you be over his/her reaction?	very unconcerned					very concerned
	1	2	3	4	5	6
I would expect that he/she would be willing to discuss our possible options without getting defensive.	very unlikely					very likely
	1	2	3	4	5	6

4. You ask your supervisor for help with a problem you have been having at work.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not the person would want to help you?	very unconcerned					very concerned
	1	2	3	4	5	6
I would expect that he/she would want to try to help me out.	very unlikely					very likely
	1	2	3	4	5	6

5. After a bitter argument, you call or approach your significant other because you want to make up.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your significant other would want to make up with you?	very unconcerned					very concerned
	1	2	3	4	5	6
I would expect that he/she would be at least as eager to make up as I would be.	very unlikely					very likely
	1	2	3	4	5	6

6. You ask your parents or other family members to come to an occasion important to you.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not they would want to come?	very unconcerned					very concerned
	1	2	3	4	5	6
I would expect that they would want to come.	very unlikely					very likely
	1	2	3	4	5	6

7. At a party, you notice someone on the other side of the room that you'd like to get to know, and you approach him or her to try to start a conversation.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not the person would want to talk with you?	very unconcerned					very concerned
	1	2	3	4	5	6
I would expect that he/she would want to talk with me.	very unlikely					very likely
	1	2	3	4	5	6

8. Lately you've been noticing some distance between yourself and your significant other, and you ask him/her if there is something wrong.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not he/she still loves you and wants to be with you?	very unconcerned					very concerned
	1	2	3	4	5	6
I would expect that he/she will show sincere love and commitment to our relationship no matter what else may be going on.	very unlikely					very likely
	1	2	3	4	5	6

9. You call a friend when there is something on your mind that you feel you really need to talk about.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your friend would want to listen?	very unconcerned					very concerned
	1	2	3	4	5	6
I would expect that he/she would listen and support me.	very unlikely					very likely
	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix D: Goldberg's Big Five Questionnaire

Instructions: For the following questions, please indicate how true these statements are to you on a scale from 1, strongly disagree, to 7, strongly agree.

I see Myself as Someone Who...

- ___ 1. Is depressed, blue
- ___ 2. Is relaxed, handles stress well
- ___ 3. Can be tense
- ___ 4. Worries a lot
- ___ 5. Is emotionally stable, not easily upset
- ___ 6. Can be moody
- ___ 7. Remains calm in tense situations
- ___ 8. Gets nervous easily

Scoring: BFI scale scoring ("R" denotes reverse-scored items):

Neuroticism: (1) 4, (2) 9R, (3) 14, (4) 19, (5) 24R, (6) 29, (7) 34R, (8) 39