

Translation and Cross-cultural Validation of Children Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire (CRSQ) for Pakistani Adolescents

Sultan Shujja, Farah Malik, and Nashi Khan

University of the Punjab

Within cultural perspective, it was aimed to translate Children Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire (CRSQ; Downey, Lebolt, Rincón, & Freitas., 1998) into native language (Urdu) in order to assess the sensitivity level of children and adolescents pertaining to peer and teacher rejection. This questionnaire has strong theoretical grounds and sound psychometric properties. The standardized back translation procedure was followed to make the translation authentic and final translated version was administered on conveniently drawn sample ($N = 313$) with age range 14-18 years ($M = 16.46$, $SD = 1.24$) from four cities of Punjab. In order to evaluate psychometric properties of CRSQ (Urdu translation), exploratory factor analysis was conducted to explore factor structure within cultural perspective. A large number of items were exclusively loaded in single factor except few items that have been discussed with reference to cultural and situational context. Besides, three subscales were significantly correlated and alpha reliability coefficients reflected significant internal consistency ranging from .74-.85. Convergent and discriminant validity were also computed along with gender differences on three scales of CRSQ (Urdu). Findings have been discussed within cultural context.

Keyword. Peer and teacher rejection, cross-cultural validation, cultural perspective, gender differences

As parental social support and security paves the way for positive physical and psychological developmental outcomes like academic achievement and self-esteem (Doyle & Markiewicz, 2005; Milevsky, Schlechter, Netter, & Keehn, 2007); the deteriorating and damaging impact of parental or social rejection should not be overlooked (Leary, 2001). Adolescence has been characterized as age of higher emotional

Sultan Shujja, Farah Malik, and Nashi Khan, Centre for Clinical Psychology, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Sultan Shujja, Centre for Clinical Psychology, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan. E-mail: sultanshujja@gmail.com

reactivity and increased interaction with peers. As children step into the age of adolescence, they begin to consider peers and teachers as personality shaping agents. Owing to greater sense of belongingness with peers, peer group's rejection or exclusion certainly causes several internalizing problems like loneliness and depression (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Zimmer-Gembeck, Hunter, & Pronk, 2007). Rejection (parental, teacher or peer) distorts children's ability to cope with complexity and difficulties in managing wider span of social interactions after the transition into adolescence (Harb, Heimberg, Fresco, Schneier, & Leibowitz, 2002).

Rejection sensitivity theory proposes that rejection sensitivity (RS) refers to individuals' perception and over-reaction to prior expectations of rejection; and individuals who defensively expect, instantly perceive, and overreact to rejection are more likely to be rejection sensitive (Downey & Feldman, 1996; Downey et al., 1997). Rejection sensitivity leads the individual to acute sensitivity to search environmental cues pertaining to rejection, and thus, enhances the possibility of perceived rejection (Downey, Mougios, Ayduk, London, & Shoda, 2004). These social sensitivity patterns are so strong and enduring that expected rejection and its subsequent impacts may prolong to adulthood (Roberts, Caspi, & Moffitt, 2001; Schulenberg, Bryant, & O'Malley, 2004).

Prior expectation of rejection in early adolescence can influence subsequent behaviours and cause mental health problems and interpersonal difficulties (Arnett, 2000; Ruble & Seidman, 1996). Considerable attention has been focused on potential developmental outcomes of rejection sensitivity and research evidences ensure the association of rejection sensitivity with psychosocial difficulties like social withdrawal, anxiety, loneliness, and depression which in turn effect their social relationships perhaps due to lack of affective coping strategies (Ayduk, Downey, & Kim, 2001; Downey, Lebolt, Rincón, & Freitas, 1998; Sandstrom, Cillessen, & Eisenhower, 2003). Researchers claim significant link between rejection sensitivity and peer rejection in early adolescents and subsequent interpersonal difficulties, however, limited research has focused teacher rejection sensitivity (Downey et al., 1998).

Adolescents experiencing acceptance by peers in early phase become less sensitive to rejection in later adolescence. The reason may be that peer acceptance in early age provides ground for learning social skills and this acquisition of social skills lead adolescents to become less rejection sensitive (Cohen, 2004; La Greca & Harrison, 2005). As interaction of adolescents with peers increases, rejection sensitivity also becomes increasingly important in development of

interpersonal relationships and rejection sensitivity emerges as indicator of interpersonal maladjustment (Ayduk, Downey, Testa, Yen, & Shoda, 1999; Buhrmester, 1990; Downey & Feldman, 1996; Downey et al., 1998). London, Downey, Bonica, and Paltin (2007) conducted a longitudinal study on middle-school students and findings revealed that peer rejection at first time was strong predictor of angry and anxious expectation of peer rejection at the second time point. They concluded that peer rejection in Time 1 significantly predicted angry and anxious expectations of rejection on Time 2 in male adolescents and early peer rejection was found to be strongly associated with angry and anxious expectations of rejection in adulthood.

Another study showed that expectations of rejection were strongly associated with interpersonal difficulties, aggression, jealousy, controlling behaviour, physical violence among men, violent relationship with peers and teachers, and dropout from schools in early adolescents (Levy, Ayduk, & Downey, 2001). It seems logical that rejection sensitive adolescents are less likely to acquire high level of social competence and vice versa. Similarly, positive association between the measures indicates that measures explore similar dimension and culminate convergent validity for each others. For example, rejection has been found to be associated with depression, loneliness, and externalizing problems (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Zimmer-Gembeck et al., 2007). However, discriminant and convergent validity of CRSQ for Pakistani adolescents is yet to be established.

These two dimensions of rejection sensitivity angry and anxious expectations of rejection, (Downey et al., 1998) lead the early adolescents to show different types of behavioural reactions. Adolescents high on anxious expectations are likely to show social anxiety or withdrawal, while those who are high on anger expectations exhibit aggression; and researchers also claim that rejection triggers social, affective, and cognitive maladaptive developmental outcomes (Dodge et al., 2003; Ladd, 2003; London et al., 2007; Sandstrom et al., 2003). In the similar vein, anxious expectation of rejection sensitivity was significant predictor of anxiety and depression among adolescents, while angry expectation of rejection sensitivity did not predict. Angry expectation of rejection sensitivity of adolescents who had less peer and parental support was predictive of depression symptoms, but angry expectation of rejection sensitivity did not predict depression when at least one supportive relationship is available (McDonald, Bowker, Rubin, Laursen, & Duchene, 2010).

Rationale of the Study

The existing literature on rejection sensitivity highlights its significance in various life settings that is, interpersonal relationships, psychological health, academic achievement, and personality development (Doyle & Markiewicz, 2005; Milevsky et al., 2007). Cross-cultural researches demonstrate that rejection sensitivity influences personal and social development regardless of cultural, social, and ethnic dynamics (Ayduk et al., 1999; Buhrmester, 1990; Downey & Feldman, 1996; Downey et al., 1998). For measuring rejection sensitivity, Children Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire (CRSQ; Downey et al., 1998) has been widely used and is considered to be the most reliable and valid measure (e.g., Harb et al., 2002; Roberts et al., 2001; Schulenberg et al., 2004).

Given the importance of rejection sensitivity, it has not been explored in Pakistan, perhaps, due to lack of valid and reliable measure. This deficiency led us to search for suitable measure and the search culminated CRSQ (See Downey et al., 1998). This questionnaire was decided to be translated into Urdu language and validated as a part of PhD research, because it was the only measure available to assess rejection sensitivity of children and adolescents Using Standardized translation procedure in order to make CRSQ clearly understandable and comprehensible for the designated sample. Another reason for selecting CRSQ was that Downey et al. (1998) claim this measure as culturally unbiased and can be used across the cultures. For this purpose, formal written permission was sought from original author of CRSQ.

Method

Children Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire (CRSQ)

Downey et al. (1998) developed CRSQ that comprised of 12 vignettes in which peer and teacher rejection might be possible. They operationalized rejection sensitivity in terms of anxious or angry expectations of rejection, feeling rejection after perceiving ambiguous intention of rejection, and overreacting to rejection. CRSQ contains factorially driven Anxious Expectations of Rejection and Angry expectations of rejection from teachers and peers as exclusive factors with Cronbach's $\alpha = .79$ (both factors) and test-retest reliability of Angry Expectation of Rejection, Angry Reaction to Ambiguously Intentioned Rejection and Feeling Disliked remained .82, .84, and .85, respectively.

Each vignette includes situation in which potential rejection is expected either from peers or teachers. For example, "Imagine you

have just moved and you are walking home from school. You wish you had someone to walk home with. You look up and see in front of you another kid from class, and you decide to walk up to this kid and start talking. As you rush to catch up, you wonder if he/she will want to talk to you.” This situation is followed by three questions) “How NERVOUS would you feel, RIGHT THEN, whether or not he/she will want to talk to you?” assesses Anxious Expectations of Rejection from peers using response format ranging from *not nervous* to *very, very nervous* at 6-point rating scale) “How MAD would you feel, RIGHT THEN, whether or not he/she will want to talk to you?” assesses angry expectations of Rejection from Peers using response format ranging from *not mad* to *very, very mad* at 6-point rating scale) “Do you think he/she will want to talk to you?” assesses the feeling of rejection from peers using response format ranging from *Yes – No* at 6-point rating scale. Lower scores on these three questions would reflect lower level of anxious, angry or overall expectations of rejection from peers and teacher, and vice versa.

Translation Procedure

Following steps were followed to translate CRSQ:

Step I: Translation of CRSQ into Urdu language. In order to translate the CRSQ into native language (Urdu), 5 bilingual university teachers (2 female and 3 male) who had PhD degree in Psychology and vast experience in translation were requested to translate CRSQ (containing 12 vignettes following three questions each) into Urdu. The translators were asked to keep situational and thematic context in mind rather than just word-to-word or sentence-to-sentence translation.

Step II: Selection of best translated vignettes and subsequent questions using committee approach. The contents, situational context, grammatical structure, wording of five Urdu translations were reviewed and scrutinized by committee of 3 researchers (Associate Professor of Psychology and two PhD scholars) from Department of Psychology, GC University, Lahore, and best translated vignettes and their corresponding questions were selected. Best translated vignettes and their corresponding questions were assembled to generate a new draft and each vignette contained 12 vignettes and three questions following each vignette. This final draft of CRSQ (Urdu version) was again scrutinized by another committee of experts (two Assistant Professors of Psychology and one PhD scholar) comparing with original CRSQ to check its situational thematic compatibility.

Step III: Back Translation of CRSQ (Urdu Translation) into English Language. The finalized Urdu translation was given to two bilingual teachers of English Department, University of Sargodha, and their minimum qualification was M Phil English. They were asked to translate CRSQ (Urdu version) into English according to situational and thematic context and not to use just word to word narration. To get desired back translation, they were further asked to cover the true sense of each vignette and its subsequent questions.

These two back translations were compared with original version of CRSQ (Downey et al., 1998) by committee of experts and critically evaluated on the grounds that whether back translations were reflecting same situational and contextual sense as did the original CRSQ? Whether grammatical structure and vocabulary used in back translations was compatible to original CRSQ? After developing consensus among experts regarding contextual and semantic compatibility between back translation and original CRSQ, the measure was administered on designated sample for validation.

Step IV: Empirical evaluation and cross-cultural validation of CRSQ (Urdu version). The finalized Urdu version of CRSQ was administered on adolescent sample in order to assess its factor structure and to compare with original factor structure reported by Downey et al. (1998). The objective was to validate cross-cultural factor composition and to identify whether same factor structure emerges in Pakistani culture as compared to that reported by original author. For this purpose, Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted but some of the indices (GFI = .82, RMSEA = .08, CFI = .69, NFI = .80) indicated poor model fit. The CFA indicated that data did not support the specified model. On the next step, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was carried out to explore factor structure within cultural context. Further, inter-scale correlations and reliability coefficients were computed in order to know whether inter-subscale correlation and alpha coefficients were consistent with that of English version of CRSQ (Downey et al., 1998).

Sample

In order to empirically evaluate the translated CRSQ, sample ($N = 313$) was conveniently drawn from different schools and colleges of four cities of Punjab. Sample comprised 140(44.72%) boys and 173(55.27%) girls with age range 14-18 years ($M = 16.46$, $SD = 1.24$) from different private ($n = 166$, 53%) and public schools ($n = 147$, 46.96%). Sample was further categorized on the basis of family system that is joint family system ($n = 121$, 38.65%) and nuclear system ($n = 192$, 61.34%).

Procedure

In order to ensure grammatical structure of sentences, composition of words and comprehension level of CRSQ, it was administered initially on five participants (3 women and 2 men). They were instructed to report any difficulty in understanding and comprehending the vignettes or corresponding questions. Each participant took 25-30 minutes and reported no difficulty in completing the questionnaire. After ensuring the suitability of CRSQ, it was administered on targeted sample after taking prior informed consent. Written informed consent was obtained from participants after disseminating the information about nature and purpose of research; practical significance of the study; potential risks and benefits; rights of participants and the researcher; confidentiality and privacy. Further, counselling services were offered if needed. Each respondent took 30 minutes on average in completing the questionnaire and formally thanked for their cooperation.

Measures

Other than Urdu translated version of CRSQ, following measures were used for validation purpose.

Child Personality Assessment Questionnaire (Child PAQ; Rohner & Khaleque, 2008). Child PAQ measures the seven personality traits that include Hostility and Aggression (physical aggression, verbal aggression, passive aggression, problem with management of hostility and aggression), Dependency, Self-esteem, Self-adequacy, Emotional Responsiveness, Emotional Stability, and Worldview. These seven personality dispositions collectively constitute psychological adjustment measured through a valid and standardized self-report measure comprising of 42 items. High score on Child PAQ indicates high level of psychological maladjustment and vice versa. Researchers have identified cross-culturally reliable cut off score of Child PAQ that is 105. Respondents who scored higher than 105 are considered as psychologically maladjusted and vice versa. Child PAQ enjoys sound psychometric properties that is, alpha reliability ranging from .73 (Hostility/Aggression) to .85 (Worldview). Response format is *almost always true* (4), *sometimes true* (3), *rarely true* (2), *almost never true* (1) and in reversed items, scoring is reversed. Sample items are “I think about fighting or being unkind” (Hostility); “I like my parents to give me a lot of love” (Dependency); “I feel I am no good and I never will be any good” (Negative Self-esteem); “I feel I cannot do things well” (Negative Self-efficacy); “I have trouble making and keeping good friends”

(Emotional Unresponsiveness); “I feel bad or get angry when I try to do something and I cannot do it” (Emotional instability); and “I see life as full of dangers” (Negative Worldview). Child PAQ was translated into Urdu using standardized back translation procedure (Naz & Kausar, 2013). In the current study, Urdu version of Child PAQ has been used with permission of original author to assess the convergent validity of CRSQ Urdu version.

Social Competence Scale for Adolescents (SCSA; Shujja, Malik, & Khan, 2015). It is an indigenously developed self-report Likert-type 4-point scale. This scale contains 53 items and six factors that constitute social competence. These factors are named as Self-efficacy, Sociability, Adaptability, Leadership, Self-confidence, and Social Initiative. These factors are statistically drawn and alpha coefficients measuring internal consistency in factors ranged from .60-.80 and for overall Scale it is .87. The response format is *always* (4), *often* (3), *sometime* (2), and *never* (1). In reverse items, scoring is reversed. The respondents who score high on SCSA are considered high on social competence and vice versa. Correlation analyses revealed that all the subscales constituting social competence of adolescents are significantly correlated with each other. In the current study, SCSA has been used to assess discriminant validity of CRSQ.

Results

The data obtained from the designated sample has been subjected to statistical analyses in order to empirically evaluate the translated version of CRSQ. Primarily, CRSQ (Urdu & English versions) was administered with the gap of two weeks on children ($n = 12$) with age range 14-18 years and item-to-item correlation was computed to ensure compatibility of original and translated items of CRSQ. Inter-item correlation ranged from .50 ($p < .05$) to .75 ($p < .001$). To further substantiate the suitability of Urdu version of CRSQ, other relevant statistical analyses were conducted. Primarily, CFA was carried out to test the model specified based on rejection sensitivity theory, but data did not support the model as indicated by some of the model fit indices (GFI = .82, RMSEA = .08, CFI = .69, NFI = .80). CFA indicated that their might by different factor structure than that of original factor structure (Downey et al., 1998). This poor model fit led us to explore factor structure for Pakistani population and for this purpose, EFA was carried out.

Table 1

Comparison of Factor Structure and Alpha Reliabilities of Urdu CRSQ and Original CRSQ (N=313)

Items	Translated CRSQ			Original CRSQ
Vignette	Angry Reaction Ambiguously Intentioned Rejection	Angry Expectations of Rejection	Feeling Disliked	
(Q2)				
1	.40	.30	.14	.38
2	.30	.20	.13	.31
3	.52	.20	.13	.50
4	.50	.21	.20	.47
5	.70	.12	.09	.62
6	.52	.09	.14	.66
7	.73	.04	.20	.69
8	.62	.13	.13	.53
9	.70	.13	.20	.64
10	.64	.24	.09	.66
11	.62	.20	.06	.61
12	.50	.40	-.04	.47
Eigen value	7.29			3.7
% of Variance	20.25			NR
α	.80			.79
(Q 1)				
1	.01	.56	.11	.59
2	.30	.40	.07	.63
3	.02	.58	-.08	.64
4	.08	.54	.01	.58
5	-.006	.62	-.05	.60
6	.15	.52	.25	.66
7	.18	.56	.05	.49
8	.30	.40	.05	.70
9	.19	.60	.15	.54
10	.08	.61	.07	.47
11	.21	.50	-.08	.65
12	.13	.60	-.04	NR
Eigen value	3.27			4.3
% of Variance	9.1			NR
α	.85			.84
Feeling Rejected (Q 3)				
1	.21	.10	.33	NR
2	-.15	.06	.34	.66
3	.09	.07	.50	NR
4	.22	-.09	.50	NR
5	-.004	.04	.70	.70
6	.23	.01	.60	NR

Continued...

Items	Translated CRSQ			Original CRS
Vignette	Angry Reaction	Angry	Feeling	

	Ambiguously Intentioned Rejection	Expectations of Rejection	Disliked	
Feeling Rejected (Q 3)				
1	.21	.10	.33	NR
2	-.15	.06	.34	.66
3	.09	.07	.50	NR
4	.22	-.09	.50	NR
5	-.004	.04	.70	.70
6	.23	.01	.60	NR
7	-.01	-.04	.71	.73
8	.14	-.01	.64	.45
9	.23	-.04	.60	NR
10	.22	.03	.60	.66
1 1	.20	.12	.52	.67
1 2	-.23	.09	.21	NR
Eigen values	2.01			2.5
% of Variance	5.58			NR
α	.74			.72

Note. Factor loadings borrowed from "Rejection Sensitivity and Children's Interpersonal Difficulties" by G. Downey, A. Lebolt, C. Rincón and A. L. Freitas, 1998, *Child Development*, 69(4), 1074-1091 and reported with the permission of original author; NR = Not Reported in the original source

Bartlett's test of sphericity is used to test overall significance of all correlations within the correlation matrix and appeared to be significant ($\chi^2 (630) = 3359.94$, $p < .001$) which indicates that it is appropriate to use factor analysis on the data set. The KMO measure of sample adequacy is used to test strength of relationship and the value (KMO = .87) is found to be acceptable and allow to run factor analysis on the given data set.

Principle Component Factor Analysis with Verimax Rotation has resulted in same factor structure as Downey and her colleagues (1998) initially reported. The factors containing eigen values greater than 1 and items containing factor loadings .30 or greater have been retained. In order to make psychometric characteristics comparable, the criteria for factor retention and item selection used by Downey et al. (1998) has been followed. Results reveal that factor structure initially explored in USA is consistent with that of Pakistani adolescents and reliability analysis substantiates the findings reporting similar alpha coefficients as reported in original source (Downey et al., 1998). Further analysis demonstrates that Factor 1 (Angry Reactions to Ambiguously Intentioned Rejection) accounts for 20.25% variance in explaining rejection sensitivity followed by 9.1% and 5.58% variance

account for Factor II (Angry Expectation of Rejection), and Factor III (Feeling Rejected), respectively.

Due to consistency of factor structure with original factor structure (Downey et al., 1998), same factor names are retained as that of original. Although there are few items loaded on more than one factor with slight variation in factor loadings (e.g., vignette 1 & 12 of Q 2), but factor loadings of these items closer to the original factor loadings (Downey et al., 1998) are retained. Secondly, factor loading of vignette 12 of Q 3 is below the factor loading criterion (.30), but retained with consultation of original author. The reason behind the retention of low factor loading item is that scoring of each vignette is carried out by scoring all three questions following each vignette and scoring of vignette remains incomplete in case of discarding a single question.

Table 2

Correlation Analyses and Reliability Analyses Reflecting Inter-Scale Correlations and Internal Consistency of CRSQ (N = 313)

Subscales	1	2	3	4	5	M	SD
1 Angry Expectations of Rejection	-	.54** (.39**)	.20* (.29**)	.13* (.13*)	-.10	39.3	12.7
2 Angry Reaction to Ambiguously Intentioned Rejection		-	.40** (.65**)	.20**	-.009	33.05	12.9
3 Feeling Rejected			-	.20**	-.23**	28.5	10.0
4 Child Personality Assessment Questionnaire				.13*	-.61**		
5 Social Competence Scale for Adolescents							

Note. Correlation coefficients in parentheses are borrowed with permission from original source (Downey et al., 1998). * $p < .01$, ** $p < .001$.

Table 2 demonstrates that correlations among subscales of CRSQ are positively and significantly correlated with each other and are comparable to correlation coefficients reported in the original source (Downey et al., 1998).

Consistent with the anticipation, Child PAQ has been found to be significantly positively correlated with all subscales of CRSQ-Urdu. These findings indicate that higher level of rejection sensitivity is associated with higher level of psychological maladjustment and vice versa. These findings fulfil the criterion for convergent validity of CRSQ as Cohen, Swerdlik, and Sturman (2013) reported two

measures of similar nature tend to be positively correlated with each other indicating convergent validity and two opposite constructs should be un-correlated or negatively correlated with each other indicating discriminant validity. Consistent with criterion for discriminant validity defined by Cohen et al., (2013), Social Competence Scale for adolescents appears to be negatively correlated with all subscales of CRSQ-Urdu.

The research findings on gender difference on rejection sensitivity are mixed. Downey et al., (1998) reported that no gender difference exists in level of rejection sensitivity. However, other studies reported that girls exhibit higher level of rejection sensitivity compared to that of boys (Erozkan, 2009; Volz & Kerig, 2010). Another rejection sensitivity study reported that boys show high level of rejection sensitivity in the age of 16-17 years and after 18 years of age, gender difference disappears (Marston, Hare, & Allen, 2010). These studies provide rationale for carrying out gender difference analysis in rejection sensitivity.

Table 3

Independent Sample t-test Showing Gender Differences on Three Subscales of Urdu Version of CRSQ (N = 313)

Subscales	Boys (n = 140)		Girls (n = 173)		t(311)	p	95% CI		Cohen's d
	M	SD	M	SD			LL	UL	
AER	35.1	11.3	42.8	12.7	-5.5	.001	-10.40	-4.96	.64
ARAIR	29.1	11.7	36.2	13.0	-5.0	.001	-9.94	-4.35	.57
FD	28.1	9.8	28.9	10.2	-.68	.49	-3.04	1.47	.07

Note. CI = Confidence Interval; LL = Lower Limit; UL = Upper Limit; AER = Angry Expectations of Rejection; ARAIR= Angry Reaction to Ambiguously Intentioned Rejection; FD= Feeling Disliked.

Table 3 shows that boys and girls are significantly different from each other in Angry Expectations of Rejection and Angry Reaction to Ambiguously Intentioned Rejection. Girls have scored higher than that of boys on both subscales. Effect sizes also reveal moderate level of difference among groups. The gender difference is non-significant on Feeling Rejected. The above Table 3 demonstrates that girls more angrily expect rejection and angrily react to ambiguously intentioned rejection that boys do.

Discussion

The roots of rejection sensitivity can be traced back into attachment theory (Bowlby, 1998; Sroufe, 1990). This theory proposed that a) acceptance/rejection expectations of children have more prominent and stronger influence on the way they perceive social situations; b) expectation of rejection or acceptance determine the internal working model of developing and maintaining relationship. In the same vein, rejection sensitivity theory adapts these two features of attachment theory that such working models can affect the behaviour and social interaction and when individuals pick the cues regarding rejection, even ambiguous or minor; they become more vigilant and readily expect potential rejection accompanied with anger and anxiety and ultimately feel rejected (Downey & Feldman, 1996). To measure rejection sensitivity, Downey et al. (1998) empirically developed CRSQ containing twelve vignettes and three questions subsequent to each vignette and it has been used in various Western researches e.g., (see London et al., 2007; McDonald et al., 2010). CRSQ enjoys strong psychometric support that is, statistically derived factor structure, high alpha reliability ranging from .72-.84, significant inter-scale correlation and convergent, and discriminant validity (see Downey et al., 1998).

In the current study, CRSQ was translated into Urdu and its suitability for targeted sample was ensured by using empirical procedure. Principle component factor analysis with varimax rotation was carried out using .30 as criterion for factor loading to explore factorial structure of CRSQ within indigenous culture. Before conducting EFA, CFA provided poor model fit indices. Thus, exploratory factor analysis was carried out and findings demonstrated that factor loadings were comparable to that of original factor structure (Downey et al., 1998) except few inconsistencies. Children Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire contains vignettes and each vignette is followed by three questions that reflect rejection sensitivity related to peers and teachers. On the vignette 1 and 2, respondents could not clearly differentiate between angry reactions to ambiguously intentioned rejection (behavioural aspect of rejection sensitivity) and angry expectations of rejection (cognitive aspect of rejection sensitivity) in the given situation. This overlap tends to be associated with nature of vignette instead of respondent's perception because respondents have clearly differentiated in question 1 and 2 of other vignettes. However, this issue was settled by retaining items which contained factor loadings closer to original factor loadings (Downey et al., 1998). In addition, factor loading of question 3 of vignette 12 appeared to be below (.20) than set criterion (.30), but this item was

retained with consultation of original author. The logic behind the retention was that each vignette of CRSQ is scored using the formula devised by Downey et al., (1998). According to this formula, score of question 1 and 2 of each vignette is separately divided by question 3 and multiplied by number of situation. This scoring formula incorporates scores of all three questions and removal of any question could leave the vignette un-scored. Therefore, it was decided to retain the item even with low factor loading.

These findings strongly support the working model of rejection sensitivity that is, situations inheriting element of rejection may lead the child to angrily expect and react to ambiguously intentioned rejection and, in turn, having feeling of rejection (see Downey et al., 1998). All subscales of CRSQ (Urdu) emerged to be significantly correlated with each other and alpha coefficients reflected high internal consistency. As anticipated, all the subscales of CRSQ were found to be significantly and positively correlated with Child PAQ (Rohner & Khaleque, 2008) and these findings provide evidence for convergent validity of CRSQ (Cohen et al., 2013). The respondents who were less psychologically adjusted tended to perceive more peer and teacher rejection and vice versa. These findings provided the evidence for convergent validity of CRSQ. Similarly as anticipated, the negative and significant correlation between Feeling Rejected and Social Competence Scale provided evidence for discriminant validity (Cohen et al., 2013).

Literature provides support for convergent and discriminant validity of CRSQ as rejection sensitivity positively predicted depression, anxiety, loneliness, and psychosocial difficulties (Ayduk, Downey, & Kim, 2001; Downey, Lebolt, Rincón, & Freitas, 1998; Sandstrom, Cillessen, & Eisenhower, 2003) whereas rejection sensitive children and adolescents turn out to be ineffective in using coping strategies and handling social situation and vice versa (Ayduk, Downey, Testa, Yen, & Shoda, 1999; Buhrmester, 1990; Downey & Feldman, 1996; Downey et al., 1998). The relationship between CRSQ and social competence appeared to be negative which indicates discriminant validity. Although correlation of two indices of rejection sensitivity (angry expectations of rejection and angry reactions to ambiguously intentioned rejection) with overall social competence remained non-significant but negative sign clearly indicated that both indices were measuring construct (rejection sensitivity) opposite to the social competence.

The current study further reported significant gender differences on angry expectations of rejection and angry reaction to ambiguously intentioned rejection. Girls more angrily expected and reacted to

ambiguously intentioned rejection from peers and teachers than boys did. These results are in line with research reporting that female adolescents are more rejection sensitive than the boys (Strimpfel, Watkins, Mena, Abbas, & Macfie, 2013). Another study revealed that women are more rejection sensitive as compared to men (Finzi-Dottan, Har-Even, & Raz, 2011). The reason may be that girls are socialized to be submissive and inferior within male dominant Pakistani culture and boys are given preference since childhood. Girls become more sensitive and readily perceive environmental cues, even mild, related to rejection. This pre-established cognitivesocial pattern continues to influence their interpersonal relationships.

Implications and Suggestions

This study provided a valid and reliable measure for rejection sensitivity of children and adolescents. It may be useful to identify rejection sensitive children and adolescents, so that intervention could be planned to eradicate negative developmental outcomes related to rejection sensitivity. Counsellors and clinical psychologists may help the teachers, parents, and peer to consciously monitor their interpersonal relationship to avoid faulty interpretation of environmental cues at the part of adolescents. Current study may also provide directions to researchers in order to make them realize about importance of rejection sensitivity in different settings of life.

Limitations of the Study

The Urdu translated CRSQ has been validated on sample drawn through convenient sampling technique, which may restrict external validity of the measure. One may extend this work by including diverse sample in order to enhance its external validity.

Conclusion

Conclusively, CRSQ was translated into Urdu using standardized back translation procedure and final Urdu version was empirically evaluated by administering on the designated sample. In order to test construct validity, exploratory factor analysis was carried out after having poor model fit generated through CFA. The factor structure obtained through EFA for the current sample was found compatible with that of original source (Downey et al., 1998) except few inconsistencies. Besides, other statistical tests such as inter-scale

correlations and alpha coefficients were found to be equivalent with that of original source and correlation coefficients indicating convergent and discriminant validity were in line with the findings of existing literature. Despite the limitations, CRSQ can be confidently used for investigating rejection sensitivity among Pakistani children and adolescents.

References

- Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55(5), 469-480. doi:10.1037//0003-066X.55.5.469
- Ayduk, O., Downey, G., & Kim, M. (2001). Rejection sensitivity and depressive symptoms in women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(7), 868-877. Retrieved from journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0146167201277009
- Ayduk, O., Downey, G., Testa, A., Yen, Y., & Shoda, Y. (1999). Does rejection elicit hostility in rejection sensitive women? *Social Cognition*, 17(2), 245-271. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/d7e2/74d3fa743d58d644df1c50195234486d5bb2.pdf>
- Bowlby, E. J. M. (1998). *Attachment and Loss: vol. 2: Separation: Anger and Anxiety*. Pimlico.
- Buhrmester, D. (1990). Intimacy of friendship, interpersonal competence, and adjustment during preadolescence and adolescence. *Child Development*, 61, 1101-1111. doi: 10.2307/1130878
- Cohen, S. (2004). Social relationships and health. *American Psychologist*, 59(8), 676-684.
- Cohen, R. J., Swerdlik, M. E., & Sturman, E. D. (2013). *Psychological testing and assessment: An introduction to tests and measurement*. Boston: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Crick, N. R., & Grotpeter, J. K. (1995). Relational aggression, gender and social-psychological adjustment. *Child Development*, 66, 710-722. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>
- Dodge, K. A., Lansford, J. E., Burks, V. S., Bates, J. E., Pettit, G. S., Fontaine, R., & Price, J. M. (2003). Peer rejection and social information processing factors in the development of aggressive behavior problems in children. *Child development*, 74(2), 374-393.
- Downey, G., & Feldman, S. I. (1996). The implications of rejection sensitivity for intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 1327-1343. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.70.6.1327
- Downey, G., Khouri, H., & Feldman, S. (1997). Early interpersonal trauma and adult adjustment: The mediational role of rejection sensitivity. In D. Cicchetti & S. Toth (Eds.), *Rochester symposium on developmental*

- psychopathology* (pp. 85-114). Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.
- Downey, G., Lebolt, A., Rincón, C., & Freitas, A. L. (1998). Rejection sensitivity and children's interpersonal difficulties. *Child Development*, 69(4), 1074-1091. doi: 10.2307/1132363
- Downey, G., Mougios, V., Ayduk, O., London, B., & Shoda, Y. (2004). Rejection sensitivity and the defensive motivational system: Insights from the startle response to rejection cues. *Psychological Science*, 15, 668-673. doi: 10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00738.x
- Doyle, A. B., & Markiewicz, D. (2005). Parenting, marital conflict, and adjustment from early-to-mid-adolescence: Mediated by adolescent attachment style? *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 34, 97-110. doi:10.1007/s10964-005-3209-7
- Erozkan, A. (2009). Rejection sensitivity levels with respect to attachment styles, gender, and parenting styles: A study with Turkish students. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 37(1), 1-14.
- Finzi-Dottan, R., Har-Even, D., & Raz, G. (2011). Who is sensitive to rejection? The role of attachment, narcissism, and fear of intimacy. In E. Kourkotas & F. Erkman (Eds.), *Interpersonal acceptance and rejection: Social, emotional, and educational contexts*. (pp. 183-195). Florida: BrownWalker Press.
- Harb, G. C., Heimberg, R. G., Fresco, D. M., Schneier, F. R., & Leibowitz, M. R. (2002). The psychometric properties of interpersonal sensitivity measure in social anxiety disorder. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, 40, 961-979. Retrieved from [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7967\(01\)00125-5](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7967(01)00125-5)
- Khaleque, A., & Rohner, R. P. (2008). *Handbook for the study of parental acceptance and rejection*. Storrs, Connecticut: Rohner Research.
- La Greca, A. M., & Harrison, H. M. (2005). Adolescent peer relations, friendships, and romantic relationships: Do they predict social anxiety and depression? *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 34(1), 49-61. doi: 10.1207/s15374424jccp3401_5
- Ladd, G. (2003). Probing the adaptive significance of children's behavior in the school context: A child by environment perspective. *Advances in Child Development and Behavior*, 31, 43-104. doi: 10.1016/S0065-2407(03)31002-X
- Leary, M. R. (2001). Toward a conceptualization of interpersonal rejection. In M. R. Leary (Ed.), *Interpersonal rejection* (pp. 3-20). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Levy, S. R., Ayduk, O., & Downey, G. (2001). The role of rejection sensitivity in people's relationships with significant others and valued social groups. In M. R. Leary (Eds.), *Interpersonal rejection* (pp. 251-288). New York: Oxford University Press.

- London, B., Downey, G., Bonica, C., & Paltin, I. (2007). Social causes and consequences of rejection sensitivity. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 17(3), 481-506. doi: 10.1111/j.1532-7795.2007.00531.x
- Marston, E. G., Hare, A., & Allen, J. P. (2010). Rejection sensitivity in late adolescence: Social and emotional sequelae. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 20(4), 959-982.
- McDonald, K. L., Bowker, J. C., Rubin, K. H., Laursen, B., & Duchene, M. S. (2010). Interactions between rejection sensitivity and supportive relationships in the prediction of adolescents' internalizing difficulties. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 39(5), 563-74. doi: 10.1007/s10964-010-9519-4
- Milevsky, A., Schlechter, M., Netter, S., & Keehn, D. (2007). Maternal and paternal parenting styles in adolescents: Associations with self-esteem, depression and life satisfaction. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 16, 39-47. doi: 10.1007/s10826-006-9066-5
- Roberts, B. W., Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. E. (2001). The kids are alright: Growth and stability in personality development from adolescence to adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(4), 670-683. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037>
- Ruble, D. N., & Seidman, E. (1996). Social transitions: Windows into social psychological processes. In E. T. Higgins & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 830-856). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Sandstrom, M. J., Cillessen, A. H. N., & Eisenhower, A. (2003). Children's appraisal of peer rejection experiences: impact on social and emotional adjustment. *Social Development*, 12(4), 530-550. doi: 10.1111/1467-9507.00247
- Schulenberg, J. E., Bryant, A.L., & O'Malley, P. M. (2004). Taking hold of some kind of life: How developmental tasks relate to trajectories of well-being during the transition to adulthood. *Development and Psychopathology*, 16(4), 1119-1140. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15704830>
- Shujja, S., Malik, F., & Khan, N. (2015). Social Competence Scale for Adolescents (SCSA): Development and validation within cultural perspective. *Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, 25(1), 59-77.
- Sroufe, L. A. (1990). An organizational perspective on the self. In D. Cicchetti & M. Beeghly (Eds.), *The self in transition: Infancy to childhood* (pp.281-307). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Strimpfel, J. M., Watkins, C. D., Mena, C. G., Abbas, A., & Macfie, J. (2013, April). Rejection sensitivity and negative relationships in adolescent offspring of mothers with borderline personality disorder. Paper presented at the Society for Research in Child Development Biennial Meeting, Seattle, WA.

- Volz, A. R., & Kerig, P. K. (2010). Relational dynamics associated with adolescent dating violence: The roles of rejection sensitivity and relational insecurity. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma*, 19(6), 587-602.
- Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J., Hunter, T. A., & Pronk, R. (2007). A model of behaviors, peer relations, and depression: Perceived social acceptance as a mediator and the divergence of perceptions. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 26, 273-302. doi: 10.1521/jscp.2007.26.3.273

Received June 22, 2015

Revision received July 24, 2017