Psychometric Properties of an Adapted Yemeni Version of Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire

Sumaia Mohammed Radman Zaid[1,2]*, Shahrir Jamaluddin[1], Zuraidah Baharuldin[1] and Sahar Mohammed Taresh[3]

[1]Department of Educational Psychology and Counseling, Faculty of Education, University of Malaya, 50603 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
[2]Department of Psychology, Sana'a University, 1247 Sana'a, Yemen
[3]Department of Kindergarten, Faculty of Education, Taiz University, 6803 Taiz, Yemen

ABSTRACT

Rejection sensitivity is a predisposition to anxiously expect, perceive, and strongly react to rejection. This study aimed to evaluate the psychometric properties of the adapted Yemeni version of rejection sensitivity questionnaire (Y-RSQ). The social anxiety (SA) questionnaire was used as a criterion for determining the validity of the Y-RSQ. The questionnaires were completed by a sample of 571 Yemeni students (males and females) at Sana'a University. The overall reliability of the Y-RSQ is 0.82, which indicates that 67% of the explained variance in observed total scores is due to the common factors. A Pearson product moment correlation was performed between the Y-RSQ and social anxiety scores. The analysis indicated a moderate, but significant positive relationship between Y-RSQ and social anxiety ($r = 0.50$, $p < 0.01$). The findings of the confirmatory factor analysis revealed that the structure of the Y-RSQ factors could be explained by a bifactor model in which rejection sensitivity is the general factor and two group factors, namely rejection anxiety and rejection expectancy. The findings suggested that the construct validity of the Y-RSQ is acceptable and the way people understand and respond to rejection signs varies due to bias caused by rejection anxiety and expectation of rejection. This study provided psychologists, scholars, and

counsellors with a Yemeni culture-based instrument that can help them measure rejection sensitivity among the Yemenis.

INTRODUCTION

Belongingness is an essential need which most people strive to achieve in their environment. If this objective is not accomplished, a feeling of being rejected is generated which is considered an unpleasant experience. Both theoretical and empirical studies have implied that rejection sensitivity emerges from early neglected and rejected experience with others, including caregivers and close friends (Sun et al., 2014). The individuals who encounter or face consistent rejection from parents during childhood are anxious (Yu et al., 2016), and they develop expectations that people will reject them when they look for an acknowledgement. They also have a high incentive to avoid rejection in their relationships with others (Erozkan, 2009). Rejection sensitivity is a construct developed from attachment and social cognitive learning perspectives that is conceptualised as a tendency to protectively predict (i.e., angrily or anxiously), promptly perceive, and excessively react to experiences of potential rejection in social situations (Innamorati et al., 2014). It also refers to the individual's vulnerability to anxiety about rejection in meaningful relationships, for example the relationships with parents, peers, siblings, instructors, and spouses (Yu et al., 2016). Individuals

who are highly sensitive to rejection have an inclination to be excessively mindful of social refusal signs and regularly react improperly to their own understanding of rejection. They have been found to have a long history of frequent rejection experiences and, therefore, are susceptible to psychological anxiety (Rosenbach, 2013).

Several studies have investigated rejection sensitivity in different cultural contexts. The literature review implied that rejection sensitivity has been observed to have a relationship with various psychological disorders, fundamental social anxiety, depressive symptoms, neuroticism, and borderline personality disorder (Rosenbach & Renneberg, 2011). According to Posternak and Zimmerman (2002), rejection sensitivity is also found to have a significant relationship with distress, avoidant personality disorder, and psychopathology. Based on the diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (DSM-IV), rejection sensitivity is an untypical feature of the disorder of major depression. In addition, people who have social anxiety or a borderline personality disorder are very susceptible to negative evaluation and social rejection (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). The longitudinal relations between rejection sensitivity and loneliness, anxiety, and depression are stabilised over time (Gao et al., 2017).

Affirming the connection between rejection sensitivity and depression, rejection sensitivity scores have been positively correlated with symptoms of

depression (Gilbert et al., 2006). Moreover, the interpersonal variances in rejection sensitivity and hypervigilance for rejection cues predict depression (Ayduk et al., 2000). Depressed individuals are more vulnerable to potential cues of rejection. Additionally, it is possible that the behaviour of individuals with depression causes rejection, for instance by dysfunctional social interaction conducts such as extreme reassurance pursuing (Joiner et al., 1992), social withdrawal (Ayduk et al., 2000), and less eye-contact. Thus, rejection sensitivity and depression have a reciprocal relationship, resembling a vicious cycle (De Rubeis et al., 2017). A positive association was also found between social anxiety and rejection sensitivity symptoms (Rosenbach, 2013). Rejection sensitivity is a possible proxy for social anxiety disorder (Pachankis et al., 2008). Therefore, many studies have used anxiety measures and depression measures to validate the rejection sensitivity questionnaire (e.g., Downey & Feldman, 1996; Innamorati et al., 2014; Rosenbach & Renneberg, 2011).

On the other hand, several studies have been conducted to validate the rejection sensitivity questionnaire (RSQ) in different cultural contexts such as the Italian version by Innamorati et al. (2014), the German version by Staebler et al. (2011), the Persian version by Khoshkam et al. (2012), the Korean version by Lee (2016), and the Turkish version by Erozkan (2009). These studies concluded that RSQ is a valid and reliable measure which could be used to measure rejection sensitivity. According to Özen et al. (2011), RSQ is a culture-based

instrument as they assumed that rejection expectancies may be culture specific, thus they added more items to it based on common Turkish situations. However, to date no study has been carried out to investigate the psychometric properties of the RSQ with reference to the Yemeni culture in particular and the Arab culture in general. Further, there is no instrument yet based on the Yemeni culture that can be used to measure rejection sensitivity. In addition, there is a disagreement between the results of Downey and Feldman (1996) in which they accounted for the RSQ outcomes in favour of a one-factor model and the results of Innamorati et al. (2014) in which they explained the RSQ outcomes in terms of a bifactor model.

According to Sana'a-Center For Strategic Studies (2017), the current political conflicts in Yemen are connected to the increment of sensitivity and the prevalence of different psychological disorders, especially anxiety and depression. As both of these disorders are linked to rejection sensitivity, it is thought to play a role in the increment of these disorders. The problem of the current study lies in the persistent demand to provide psychiatrists, counsellors, and researchers with a tool that can help them to test or measure rejection sensitivity among the Yemenis. This is because having a valid measure for rejection sensitivity that is suitable for the Yemeni culture would lead to accurate measurement among Yemenis. Accordingly, this would assist in using some interventions that would help in reducing the rejection sensitivity

effects and reducing the possibility that rejection sensitivity leads to mental health disorders such as anxiety and depression. As the RSQ was developed and administered in a foreign culture (i.e., the United States), which is completely different from the Yemeni culture, and assuming that the RSQ is a culture-based instrument, the application of this scale might be inappropriate for the Yemeni environment. That is because it contains some items that are incompatible with the Islamic rules and the customs which prevail in the country. For example, the item "You ask your boyfriend/girlfriend to move in with you" is related to dating and it is inconsistent with Islamic rules and society customs.

Therefore, there is a need to fill the gap in the lack of a valid and reliable instrument for rejection sensitivity that could be successfully applied in the Yemeni context. This study aimed to adapt and validate the RSQ that was developed by Downey and Feldman (1996) and confirm the number of the factors of Y-RSQ by applying the instrument on university undergraduate students in the Yemeni societal culture.

METHOD

Participants

The participants were recruited from six faculties in Sana'a University because it is the first and largest public university in Yemen and includes students from all the Yemeni provinces. Sana'a University is considered a study destination for many Yemeni students. Systematic random sampling was employed to choose the

participants. Based on the list of student enrolment in the university for the academic year 2017/2018, the researchers divided the total number of students by the sample size (27905/630= 44). Then they selected every 44th on the list to achieve the required sample size. The response rate in this study was 95%. In total, the Y-RSQ and social anxiety questionnaire were distributed to 630 students. However, only 600 students returned the questionnaires and a total number of 29 questionnaires were discarded due to either non-responses for one of the scales or a set of responses. After the final check, sorting out, and numbering the responses, only questionnaires from 571 undergraduate students (253 males and 318 females) aged between 20-25 were found to be completed and were used for the analysis.

Measures

Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire. The RSQ was developed by Downey and Feldman (1996). This questionnaire comprises 18 presumptive situations in which a participant makes a request to other people that makes him or her susceptible to rejection. For example, "You ask someone in class if you can borrow his/her notes" and "You ask your parents for help in deciding what programmes to apply to". The respondents were required to select the degree of their consent to each vignette on a six-point Likert scale. They illustrated (a) their level of anxiety about being rejected ranging from 1 ("very unconcerned") to 6 ("very concerned") and (b) rejection expectancy by indicating

their subjective possibility which assesses that the individual(s) in each situation will truly react in a positive way to their request ranging from 1 ("very unlikely") to 6 ("very likely") (Ayduk et al., 2008). Three scores could be obtained from the RSQ: the anxiety score (ranged 1- 6), the anticipation of rejection score (ranged 1 - 6), and the general score of rejection sensitivity (the score of anxiety level x the reversed score of rejection expectancy [7 - expectancy of acceptance]). Scores can range from 1-36 (Rosenbach, 2013).

In other words, each item is evaluated by two different Likert scales. The first one evaluates their anxiety about being rejected by others while the second one evaluates their expectations of rejection. The psychometric properties of the original RSQ are as follows: all the 18 RSQ items loaded at 0.30 and above, while the internal consistency was reported as 0.83 which indicates high internal consistency. Many studies validated the RSQ in different cultures and most of these studies reported quite similar psychometric properties to what Downey and Feldman (1996) have proposed (Ayduk et al., 2008; Erozkan, 2015; Ritu & Anand, 2016; Rosenbach, 2013).

The adaptation process of RSQ began by obtaining permission from the author to use this questionnaire and making some changes to make it suitable for the Yemeni culture. The researchers translated the RSQ into formal Arabic language. In order to replace the six situations (2, 4, 5, 12, 16, and 18) that are related to dating and the Western lifestyle, the researchers distributed open-ended questions to get more information about what kinds of situations that the Yemenis expect to be rejected. Furthermore, three situations have been added. On one hand, there are more situations that can make people sensitive to rejection in the Yemeni culture. For example, "You asked your friends to come to your house so that you introduced them to your family". This situation was added according to the Yemeni context as some families are very concerned about their children's friends and they do not allow them to go to their friends' houses, especially girls. If a girl is invited to one of her friends' house, her mother or older sister should accompany her.

On the other hand, the adaptation of RSQ was crucial to make the instrument valid for use not only in a school setting but also in a general life setting because many items in the original RSQ are related to school life. To confirm whether the inclusion of these three items is valid for use in general life settings, the researchers referred to the experts' judgement during content validity check. The first version of Y-RSQ consisted of 21 items.

The translated version was submitted to two lecturers who were familiar with the content of the instrument and were also experts in the English language. They were asked to check the accuracy of the translation, make corrections to the spelling and grammatical mistakes as well as to check the content. Based on the English language experts' opinions, the required amendments were made, and

the grammatical mistakes were corrected for all the items. Then the researchers handed the Y-RSQ to two experts in the Arabic language to check the structure of the sentences. Based on their comments, the researchers made some changes to the structure of the sentences. In the final step, to gain a sense of how effective the translation was, back-translation was used by asking another independent expert in the English language to blindly translate the translated questionnaire back into the original language (English) to confirm the accuracy of the RSQ translation.

To score the Y-RSQ, the researchers followed the original scoring method that was provided by the authors of the original scale. The researchers first obtained the score of rejection sensitivity for every scenario by weighing the expectation of possible rejection by the level of anxiety over its incidence. Particularly, the score of expectancy of acceptance was reversed to indicate rejection expectation (rejection expectation = 7 - expectancy of acceptance). After that, the score of rejection anxiety was multiplied by the reversed score of expectancy of acceptance. Second, the researchers computed the rejection sensitivity scores across all the situations for every participant by computing the rejection sensitivity scores for each situation and divided it by the total number of situations (21).

Social Anxiety. The social anxiety questionnaire comprises 29 items. It was developed by Radwan (2001). The questionnaire measures social anxiety using five components: (a) physical symptoms of social anxiety, (b) difficulty of communication and self-expression, (c) fear of social situations and interactions with them, (d) attention deficit or dispersion of ideas, and (e) lack of self-confidence. The participants were requested to respond on a four-point Likert scale from 1 (never), 2 (often), 3 (rarely), and 4 (always). The social anxiety questionnaire was scored by computing the score of each item and divided it by the total number of items (29). The scores of this scale range from 29-116 (Radwan, 2001).

Radwan (2001) employed three different methods to test the reliability of social anxiety questionnaire. The first method was test-retest after six weeks and the result was 0.74, which is considered a good index for the reliability. The second method was Cronbach's alpha which value was $\alpha = 0.92$. The third was split-half method and the reliability value was 0.82. To validate the social anxiety questionnaire, he used criterion-related validity and the result was 0.81, while factor analysis indicated that there were five factors with eigenvalue more than one, and the 29 items loaded with 0.40 and above.

In this study, the social anxiety questionnaire was adopted and used as it is because it was developed based on the Arabic context. Therefore, the researchers tested only the reliability of social anxiety. The overall Cronbach's alpha for social anxiety in the current study was $\alpha = 0.92$. This result is similar to the score that

Radwan had reported in his study, which indicates high reliability.

Procedures

There were some procedures which needed to be undertaken prior to the conduct of the current study. The first step was submitting a cover letter of data collection to Sana'a University explaining the aim and process of data collection. Then, the researchers obtained permission from the dean of each faculty to proceed with data collection. The names of the students who were selected from the list to take part in this study were recorded. Next, the researchers looked for those students in their classes by referring to the timetable of each department. The objectives of the study were briefed to the lecturers, who were asked to give the researchers 25-30 minutes at the end of their classes to administer the questionnaires to those who had been selected from their classes. Data collection started in May 2018. An explanation was provided to the students clarifying why only some of them had been selected. In addition, they were informed that their data were confidential and would be used for research purposes only. Then, the questionnaires were distributed to the students from all the faculties.

To preserve confidentiality, the questionnaire package was anonymous and not marked or numbered in any way. Instructions were also provided on the first page of each questionnaire to guide students on how to do it and to inform students that there is no right and wrong answer. In the instruction section of the Y-RSQ,

the researchers emphasised that students should answer each situation by choosing an answer for each Likert scale of Y-RSQ to clearly indicate their concerns about the rejection of their request in the first place and then to what extent they expected others would reject their request. Each participant was given two questionnaires, namely the Y-RSQ and social anxiety questionnaire. Both questionnaires were self-administered and took 25-30 minutes to be completely answered.

RESULTS

Validity

Validity was evaluated via three methods, namely content validity, criterion-related validity, and construct validity.

Content Validity. Content validity refers to what extent items in a measure reflect the universe of content to which the instrument is to be generalised (Taherdoost, 2016). Using this method, the experts were provided with a number of questionnaire items and they were asked to determine individualistically whether the aspects of rejection sensitivity are measured by the underlying items. In other words, whether these items are suitable or not suitable to measure the rejection sensitivity construct.

However, there were no indexes established for content validity. Alternatively, items were revised by going through two rounds of review. In the first round, a group of four experts was selected to conduct the initial validation and check or revise the questionnaire relevance.

The Y-RSQ contained 21 items with two different Likert scales and the judges had to indicate the accuracy of the translation. In the second round of review, based on the comments from the revision in the first round, a more refined version of the Y-RSQ was submitted to two experts in psychology who are bilingual in the Arabic and English languages for further content validation. Their tasks were to check whether each item was (a) suitable or (b) unsuitable to measure rejection sensitivity and which items could be discarded. Based on the first and second round of reviews, items were rewritten and refined, and no items were deleted.

Criterion-Related Validity. Criterion-related validity refers to what extent a measure is connected to an outcome. It evaluates how good one measure expects an outcome for another measure (Taherdoost, 2016). If the test scores can give a basis for accurate prediction of some criteria, that means these scores are useful. Criterion-related validity has two types, which are predictive validity and concurrent validity. In this study, concurrent validity was implemented. It is usually defined as a relationship between a measure and the relevant criteria (Lin & Yao, 2014).

Rejection sensitivity indicates the sense of personal insufficiency and misunderstanding of others' behaviour, in which perceiving rejection leads to discomfort and fear. This concept is directly linked to a fear of being negatively evaluated by other people and a fear of embarrassment, which are the key features associated with

social anxiety (Fang et al., 2011). Therefore, the researchers have used the social anxiety questionnaire as a criterion to check the concurrent validity because there are many common features between social anxiety and lately established construct of rejection sensitivity within social psychology. Consequently, cognitive biases related to rejection, increased emotional arousal in certain interpersonal circumstances, and behavioural consequences such as interpersonal problems underlie both rejection sensitivity and social anxiety (Downey & Feldman, 1996; Downey et al., 1998).

To obtain the concurrent validity, Pearson product-moment correlation (r) was used to calculate the correlation between the scores of the Y-RSQ and social anxiety questionnaire scores. The result revealed that there is a statistically significant and moderate positive relationship between Y-RSQ and social anxiety scores ($r = 0.50$, $p < 0.01$). The concurrent validity is achieved as there is a relationship between the two variables.

Construct Validity. Construct validity indicates how well you transformed, explained, and operationalised an idea, concept, or behaviour that is a construct into a functioning and operating reality (Taherdoost, 2016). The present study explored the factor structure of Y-RSQ via factor analysis in an attempt to assess whether the original factor structure described by Downey and her colleagues was replicated with the current sample. Previous findings of the Downey and Feldman's study (1996)

interpreted the results in favour of the unidimensionality of the RSQ. However, the current study aimed to confirm whether the adapted Y-RSQ represents a one-factor model as some changes have been done to the original questionnaire.

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to check the construct validity. The researchers have run the analysis first for the one-factor correlated model, second for the two-factor correlated model, and finally for the bifactor model. Based on the recommendations of (Hu & Bentler, 1998), the model fit for the Y-RSQ was gauged using a combination of fit indexes with empirically derived cutoff scores. Precisely, a good fit is indicated by the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) $\leq$ 0.06, standardised root mean square residual (SRMR) $\leq$ 0.08, and the comparative fit index (CFI) ranging from 0 to 1. Higher values indicate better model fit (Themessl-Huber, 2014), CFI $\geq$ 0.95 (Zawilinski, 2011). The chi-square (CIMN) value is 2 or as high as 5 to indicate a plausible fit (Marsh & Hocevar, 1985). The results of each model are presented in a detail as follows.

Measurement Model Assessment as a one-factor Correlated Model. Fit statistics for the Y-RSQ as one-factor correlated model were $\chi^2(463) = 1673.713$, $p < 0.001$, goodness of fit index (GFI) = 0.843, adjusted goodness of fit index (AGFI) = 0.821, RMSEA= 0.068. The value of CMIN/DF was 3.615, $p < 0.001$. Some of the indices such as GFI and AGFI were closer to the minimum acceptable range of model fit of 0.80 (Maulana & Rufaidah, 2014; Shevlina

et al., 2000). The CMIN/DF value of < 3 denotes a satisfactory fit between sample data and hypothetical model (Kline, 2005) and CMIN/DF < 5 demonstrates a plausible fit (Marsh & Hocevar, 1985). The SRMR value was 0.066. A SRMR value of less than 0.08 is mostly considered a good fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999) (see Table 1). CFI and Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) did not meet the expected fit index cutoffs (Hu & Bentler, 1998). The factor loading for an item has to be at least 0.30 on its factor. Out of the of 21 situations, five situations with low factor loading of less than 0.30 were excluded as recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) due to their poor contribution.

Measurement Model Assessment as a Two-factor Correlated Model. Fit statistics for the Y-RSQ as a two-factor model are similar to the one-factor model. The value of $\chi^2(463) = 1673.713$, $p < 0.001$, GFI = 0.843, AGFI = 0.821, RMSEA= 0.068. The value of CMIN/DF is also 3.615, p <.001, SRMR= 0.066 (see Table 1). The aforementioned indices such as GFI and AGFI are close to the minimum acceptable score of 0.80 (Maulana & Rufaidah, 2014; Shevlina et al., 2000), while CFI and TLI did not meet the expected fit index cutoffs (Hu & Bentler, 1998). The loadings of the subscales in the two-factor model were all statistically significant at $p < 0.001$ and ranged in magnitude from 0.317 to 0.578. However, factor loadings for five items were lower than the minimum acceptable range of 0.30, so these items were discarded from the analysis.

Measurement Model Assessment as a Bifactor Model. A bifactor measurement model for particular responses for a set of items indicates that the correlations between these items could be explained by (a) a general factor exemplifying the common discrepancy between all the items and (b) a set of group factors where the discrepancy is shared between the general factor and the subsets of items that are supposed to be largely similar in content. It is frequently presumed as well that the general factor and group factors are orthogonal. The general factor represents the comprehensive fundamental construct intended to be measured by an instrument, while group factors represent more theoretically particular subfactor constructs (Rodriguez et al., 2016).

Fit statistics for the Y-RSQ as a bifactor model are as follows: $\chi^2(432) = 1456.184$, $p < 0.001$, GFI = 0.863, AGFI = 0.833, RMSEA= 0.065. The value of CMIN/DF was 3.371, p <0.001, SRMR= 0.065 (see Table 1). The GFI and AGFI indices were close to the minimum acceptable score of 0.80 (Maulana & Rufaidah, 2014; Shevlina et al., 2000) although CFI and TLI did not meet the expected fit index cutoffs (Hu & Bentler, 1998). According to Page (2007), even if these indexes do not conform to Hu and Bentler (1999) rule of thumb for good

approximate fit, they indicate moderate approximate fit by their standards and thus provide mediocre support for Y-RSQ. In general, "the fit indexes that were obtained indicate overall acceptability but without being an excellent fit" (Moss et al., 2015). In some cases, the poor fit may result from items similarly phrased or appearing adjacent to each other (Lee, 2016).

Using these criteria, the large majority of items have acceptable factor loadings on their subscale factors in the one-factor model, two-factor model, and bifactor model. The results of the one-factor model and the two-factor model are similar but the outcome of the bifactor model is higher. The fit indexes that were obtained in this study indicated overall acceptability but without being an excellent fit. The results of the current study also indicated that Y-RSQ is better represented by a bifactor model because the fit indices of bifactor model are higher compared to the other two models; 16 items out of 21 loaded significantly with factor loading of 0.30 and above, while five items loaded lower than 0.30 so that these items were deleted. In applied research, factor loadings higher than or equal to 0.30 or 0.40 are often interpreted as salient, which is an indicator that these are meaningfully related to a primary or secondary factor (Timothy, 2006).

Table 1

Fit statistics for rejection sensitivity model sample (N=571)

Measure	CIMN	Probability	GFI	AGFI	RMSEA	SRMR
One-factor model	3.615	0.000	0.843	0.821	0.068	0.068
Two-factor model	3.615	0.000	0.843	0.821	0.068	0.066
Bifactor model	3.371	0.000	0.863	0.833	0.066	0.065

Reliability

Reliability analysis was performed after the validation analysis including the remaining 16 items from the CFA. Reliability was performed on each of the subscales and the total scale of the Y-RSQ in order to ascertain the consistency of the construct by using Cronbach's alpha. Cronbach's alpha coefficient is one of the most common methods to evaluate internal consistency.

The Cronbach's alpha values for each of the rejection sensitivity subscales and the overall reliability are good, whereas rejection anxiety's Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.78$, the rejection expectancy's Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.82$, and the overall reliability's Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.82$ (see Table 2). These coefficients suggest that the total scale score displays adequate internal consistency for research purposes (Funk, 2004).

Table 2

Reliability of the adapted Yemeni version of rejection sensitivity questionnaire and social anxiety questionnaire

Factors	Cronbach's alpha	Number of items
Y-RSQ first subscale (Rejection Anxiety)	.78	16
Y-RSQ second subscale (Rejection Expectancy)	.82	16
Overall Y-RSQ reliability	.82	32
SA questionnaire reliability	.92	29

DISCUSSION

This study provides an instrument that is empirically designed and appears to be a reliable and valid. The final version of the Y-RSQ consists of 16 items. A total of five out of 21 items were deleted from the scale because of the low factor loadings. The results of this study indicated that the Y-RSQ is a reliable measure since Cronbach's alpha values are very good and the item-total correlation for each item is within the acceptable range. In general, 67% of the variances were explained by these factors (rejection anxiety and rejection expectancy). The Cronbach's alpha value in this study is comparable to the reliability coefficients that were reported in the literature review using different samples from different cultures

(e.g., Bergevin, 2003; Chaudoir et al., 2017; Downey et al., 2000; Erozkan, 2009; Innamorati et al., 2014; Kraines et al., 2018; Tuskeviciute, 2017).

Based on the findings of content validity, all experts agreed that the Y-RSQ was an appropriate measure for rejection sensitivity and the selected items for the subconstructs were appropriate in general. Thus, content validity at this level is considered satisfactory. This result indicated that content validity is good and consistent with the earlier studies (e.g., Erozkan, 2009; Innamorati et al., 2014; Khoshkam et al., 2012) in which they confirmed and followed the same subconstructs or factors and the same items with few modifications according to the culture.

The criterion-related validity of Y-RSQ was evaluated by correlating the Y-RSQ with another measure, which is the social anxiety questionnaire. The findings implied that the measure of Y-RSQ was significantly and positively correlated with the measure of social anxiety. The significant positive relationship between Y-RSQ and social anxiety provided strong evidence of criterion-related validity. This result was not surprising as previous research has shown a strong and positive relationship between rejection sensitivity and social anxiety both in young and older adolescents (Tsirgielis, 2015). This finding is supported by the theory purport that rejection sensitive individuals have a predisposition to anxiously or angrily expect, perceive, and overreact to rejection. It follows, then, that these individuals may exhibit social anxiety when they perceive interpersonal rejection (Edwards, 2014).

Construct validity was used as another method to determine the validity of the Y-RSQ by using CFA. The findings of the CFA provided insights into the construct validity of Y-RSQ that might be influenced by culture bias. The Y-RSQ achieved an acceptable score. However, due to culture bias, it might not be able to capture the real state of rejection sensitivity among the Yemenis, which might be due to the sample size as well as the credibility of respondents' answers. Having some fit indices such as CFI and TLI lower than the standardised cutoff scores for the Y-RSQ might be interpreted due to cultural differences. That is because the Yemenis and Arabs generally tend to be more collectivists because of the Islamic teachings and Arab customs that show respect to family members, value group loyalty, and encourage to help others and remain humble while interacting with others. This might also be attributed to the appealing picture that people try to draw for themselves in front of others and therefore they do not give genuine answers for each situation. Some of the students' responses showed that they tried to show indifference in case the others in the scenarios did not fulfil their request.

The results of this study showed that all the fit indexes for the three suggested models of Y-RSQ are comparable. However, the bifactor fit indices are higher, which indicate that Y-RSQ is better represented by a bifactor model. This study supports the finding of Innamorati et al. (2014), who validated the extracted version of the adult RSQ on a sample of Italian students. They stated that the bifactor model had an acceptable fit to the data and rejection sensitivity was best represented by a general factor and two groups of factors.

Özen et al. (2011) assumed that rejection expectancies might be culture-specific. Thus, the current study provided scholars and psychologists in Yemen with an instrument, Y-RSQ that is culture fare. Furthermore, schools and institutions could use Y-RSQ to measure students' rejection sensitivity to avoid its influence on students' ability to form healthy relationships and interact smoothly with others in their surrounding area. It could probably be used to avoid the possible impact of rejection sensitivity on their academic performance.

Kim (2015) denoted that college students with high rejection sensitivity had appeared to exhibit a high propensity to repress their own feelings on account of fear of rejection and this was a critical element of suicide-related incidents.

CONCLUSION

The aim of this study was to adapt and validate the RSQ of Downey and Feldman (1996) to make it suitable for the Yemeni culture. Validity was assessed by using three methods, namely content validity, concurrent validity, and construct validity. Items were refined based on the experts' opinions in the content validity stage, and then concurrent validity and construct validity were investigated through administering the questionnaire to a sample of Yemeni students. The result of concurrent validity indicated that Y-RSQ is a valid instrument as it correlated significantly with the social anxiety questionnaire, while the CFA results showed that the Y-RSQ is best represented by a bifactor model. Items in the Y-RSQ have loaded significantly into their designated dimensions, namely rejection anxiety and rejection expectancy. The results of this study also indicate that Y-RSQ is a reliable measure. Overall, the results show that the Y-RSQ meets the main requirements for measurement tool in social science, and it is suitable for application in the assessment of rejection sensitivity among students in the Yemeni context and other culturally similar contexts.

Limitation and Future Directions

This study was limited to the validation of Y-RSQ on a sample of undergraduate students from one university and one district. The findings of this study suggest that future studies could be done to investigate further why the Y-RSQ resulted in acceptable fit indices in the current sample. It is recommended that future studies could further modify the items. Though the Y-RSQ has been demonstrated to be valid and reliable, researchers still need to develop better ways to assess the variation in the students' responses. In addition, there is a need to contextualise the RSQ to be used among adults in general and not only students.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (DSM-5®)* (Vol. 5). Washington, USA: American Psychiatric Pub.

Ayduk, O., Mendoza-Denton, R., Mischel, W., Downey, G., Peake, P. K., & Rodriguez, M. (2000). Regulating the interpersonal self: Strategic self-regulation for coping with rejection sensitivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*(5), 776-792. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.79.5.776

Ayduk, Ö., Zayas, V., Downey, G., Cole, A. B., Shoda, Y., & Mischel, W. (2008). Rejection sensitivity and executive control: Joint predictors of borderline personality features. *Journal of Research in Personality, 42*(1), 151-168. doi: 10.1016/j.jrp.2007.04.002

Bergevin, T. A. (2003). *Approaching rejection sensitivity from a multidimensional perspective: predicting romantic maladjustment, targets of romantic attraction and depression in middle adolescence* (Doctoral dissertation), Concordia University, Canada.

Chaudoir, S. R., Vergara-Lopez, C., & Stroud, L. R. (2017). Links between rejection sensitivity and biobehavioral response to laboratory stress in youth. *Personality and Individual Differences, 114*, 86-91. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2017.03.054

De Rubeis, J., Lugo, R. G., Witthöft, M., Sütterlin, S., Pawelzik, M. R., & Vögele, C. (2017). Rejection sensitivity as a vulnerability marker for depressive symptom deterioration in men. *PloS One, 12*(10), e0185802. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0185802

Downey, G., Feldman, S., & Ayduk, O. (2000). Rejection sensitivity and male violence in romantic relationships. *Personal Relationships, 7*(1), 45-61. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6811.2000.tb00003.x

Downey, G., & Feldman, S. I. (1996). Implications of rejection sensitivity for intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(6), 1327-1343. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.70.6.1327

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.

Retrieved September 26, 2016, from http://www.psychology.sunysb.edu/afreitas-/publications/downey_freitas_michaelis_khouri1998.pdf

Edwards, A. A. R. (2014). *Youth reports of psychological maltreatment, social anxiety, and aggression: Evaluating rejection sensitivity as a mediator* (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, USA). Retrieved November 24, 2018, from https://cutt.ly/6e4awyH

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. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2009.37.1.1

Erozkan, A. (2015). The childhood trauma and late adolescent rejection sensitivity. *Anthropologist, 19*(2), 413-422. doi: 10.1080/09720073.2015.11891675

Fang, A., Asnaani, A., Gutner, C., Cook, C., Wilhelm, S., & Hofmann, S. G. (2011). Rejection sensitivity mediates the relationship between social anxiety and body dysmorphic concerns. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 25*(7), 946-949. doi: 10.1016/j.janxdis.2011.06.001

Funk, B. (2004). *Validation of a brief students' life satisfaction scale with adolescents* (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, USA). Retrieved January 21, 2018, from https://www.proquest.com/

Gao, S., Assink, M., Cipriani, A., & Lin, K. (2017). Associations between rejection sensitivity and mental health outcomes: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review, 57*, 59-74. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2017.08.007

Gilbert, P., Irons, C., Olsen, K., Gilbert, J., & McEwan, K. (2006). Interpersonal sensitivities: Their links to mood, anger and gender.

Psychology Psychotherapy, 79(1), 37-51. doi: 10.1348/147608305X43856

Hu, L.-T., & Bentler, P. M. (1998). Fit indices in covariance structure modeling: Sensitivity to underparameterized model misspecification. *Psychological Methods, 3*(4), 424-453. doi: 10.1037/1082-989X.3.4.424

Hu, L.-T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 6*(1), 1-55. doi: 10.1080/10705519909540118

Innamorati, M., Balsamo, M., Fairfield, B., Fabbricatore, M., Tamburello, A., & Saggino, A. (2014). Construct validity and reliability of the adult rejection sensitivity questionnaire: A comparison of three factor models. *Depression Research and Treatment, 2014*, 972424. doi: 10.1155/2014/972424

Joiner, T., Alfano, M., & Metalsky, G. (1992). When depression breeds contempt - reassurance seeking, self-esteem, and rejection of depressed college-students by their roommates. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 101*(1), 165-173. doi: 10.1037/0021-843X.101.1.165

Khoshkam, S., Bahrami, F., Ahmadi, S. A., Fatehizade, M., & Etemadi, O. (2012). Attachment style and rejection sensitivity: The mediating effect of self-esteem and worry among iranian college students. *Europe's Journal of Psychology, 8*(3), 363-374. doi: 10.5964/ejop.v8i3.463

Kim, J. (2015). The relationship between convert narcissism and suicidal ideation in college students: The mediating effects of self-criticism and relationship of rejection sensitivity. *Korean Journal of Youth Studies, 22*, 77-96.

Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (2nd ed.). New York, USA; London, England: The Guilford Press.

Kraines, M. A., Kelberer, L. J., & Wells, T. T. (2018). Rejection sensitivity, interpersonal rejection, and attention for emotional facial expressions. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 59*, 31-39. doi: 10.1016/j.jbtep.2017.11.004

Lee, S. (2016). *Rejection sensitivity and maladaptive patterns of serial arguing: Implications for conflict resolution* (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, USA). Retrieved February 24, 2017, from https://search.proquest.com/docview/1795076691?accountid=28930

Lin, W.-L., & Yao, G. (2014). Concurrent validity. In A. C. Michalos (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research* (pp. 1184-1185). Dordrecht, USA: Springer Netherlands.

Marsh, H. W., & Hocevar, D. (1985). Application of confirmatory factor analysis to the study of self-concept: First-and higher order factor models and their invariance across groups. *Psychological Bulletin, 97*(3), 562. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.97.3.562

Maulana, M. R. S., & Rufaidah, P. (2014). Co-creation of small-medium enterprises. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 115*, 198-206.

Moss, T. P., Lawson, V., & White, P. (2015). Identification of the underlying factor structure of the Derriford Appearance Scale 24. *PeerJ, 3*, e1070. doi: 10.7717/peerj.1070

Özen, A., Sümer, N., & Demir, M. (2011). Predicting friendship quality with rejection sensitivity and attachment security. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 28*(2), 163-181. doi: 10.1177/0265407510380607

Pachankis, J. E., Goldfried, M. R., & Ramrattan, M. E. (2008). Extension of the rejection sensitivity construct to the interpersonal functioning of gay men. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 76*(2), 306-317. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.76.2.306

Page, E. E. (2007). *The construct and concurrent validity of worker/peer attachment* (Doctoral dissertation, Georgia Institute of Technology, Georgia). Retrieved September 17, 2018, from http://hdl.handle.net/1853/19842

Posternak, M. A., & Zimmerman, M. (2002). The prevalence of atypical features across mood, anxiety, and personality disorders. *Comprehensive Psychiatry, 43*(4), 253-262. doi: 10.1053/comp.2002.33498

Radwan, S. G. (2001). Al-qalaq al-ijtma`iy: Dirasat maydaniat `alaa `ayinat min al-Suwriiyn [Social anxiety: An empirical study of a Syrian sample]. *The Education Research Center Journal, 10*(19), 47-77.

Ritu., & Anand, M. (2016). Effect of parental modernity on rejection sensitivity and self-esteem of adolescents. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology, 3*(2). doi: 10.25215/0302.061

Rodriguez, A., Reise, S. P., & Haviland, M. G. (2016). Evaluating bifactor models: Calculating and interpreting statistical indices. *Psychological Methods, 21*(2), 137-150. doi: 10.1037/met0000045

Rosenbach, C. (2013). *Rejection sensitivity etiological aspects and psychopathological impact* (Doctoral thesis), Freie Universität Berlin, Germany.

Rosenbach, C., & Renneberg, B. (2011). Rejected, excluded, ignored: The perception of social rejection and mental disorders – a review. *Verhaltenstherapie, 21*(2), 87-98. doi: 10.1159/000328839

Sana'a-Center For Strategic Studies. (2017). *The impact of war on mental health in Yemen: A neglected crisis*. Retrieved January 10, 2018, from http://sanaacenter.org/publications/analysis/5119

Shevlina, M., Milesb, J. N., & Lewisa, C. A. (2000). Reassessing the fit of the confirmatory factor analysis of the multidimensional students life satisfaction scale: Comments on confirmatory factor analysis of the multidimensional Students' Life Satisfaction Scale. *Personality and Individual Differences, 28*(181), 181-185.

Staebler, K., Helbing, E., Rosenbach, C., & Renneberg, B. (2011). Rejection sensitivity and borderline personality disorder. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy, 18*(4), 275-283. doi: 10.1002/cpp.705

Sun, J., Li, H., Li, W., Wei, D., Hitchman, G., Zhang, Q., & Qiu, J. (2014). Regional gray matter volume is associated with rejection sensitivity: A voxel-based morphometry study. *Cognitve Affective Behavior Neuroscience 14*(3), 1077-1085. doi: 10.3758/s13415-014-0249-z

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). New York, USA: Allyn and Bacon.

Taherdoost, H. (2016). Validity and reliability of the research instrument; how to test the validation of a questionnaire/survey in a research: How to test the validation of a questionnaire/survey in a research. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management (IJARM), 5*, 28-36. https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3205040

Themessl-Huber, M. (2014). Evaluation of the [Chi]^sup 2^-statistic and different fit-indices under misspecified number of factors in confirmatory factor analysis. *Psychological Test and Assessment Modeling, 56*(3), 219-236.

Timothy, A. B. (2006). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research.* New York, USA: Guilford.

Tsirgielis, C. (2015). Rejection sensitivity in early adolescence (Master's thesis). The University of British Columbia, Canada.

Tuskeviciute, R. (2017). Navigating rejection cues: When does high level construal facilitate effective coping? (Doctoral dissertation). New York University, USA.

Yu, Y. R., Youk, G. Y., & Lee, S. H. (2016). Factors affecting rejection sensitivity in university students. Asia-pacific Proceedings of Applied Science and Engineering for Better Human Life, 7, 62-67. doi: 10.21742/asehl.2016.7.15

Zawilinski, L. (2011). Confirmatory factor analysis of the Anxiety Sensitivity Index-3 (Master's dissertation), Appalachian State University, USA.