



ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

Psychology

ATTACHMENT STYLES, REJECTION SENSITIVITY AND EMOTION REGULATION

KEY WORDS: attachment styles, rejection sensitivity, emotion regulation, young adults

Namitha Kothuru Student Hyderabad, India

Dr. Arjun Sekhar P M* Asst. Professor, Kristu Jayanti College Bangalore, India*Corresponding Author

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between attachment styles, rejection sensitivity and emotion regulation among young adults. The Revised Adult Attachment Scale (Collins, 1996), Adult Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire (Berenson et al., 2009) and Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (Gross & John, 2003) were used to collect the data. The results indicated that there is no significant difference in rejection sensitivity and emotion regulation of young adults on the basis of their gender and relationship status. A significant relationship was found significant relationship between close attachment and depend attachment styles with rejection sensitivity, between depend attachment style and emotion regulation, between anxiety attachment style and suppression dimension of emotion regulation and between rejection sensitivity and reappraisal dimension of emotion regulation. The results of the study also found a significant influence of attachment styles on emotion regulation.

Introduction

It is crucial that children develop a safe and healthy attachment style since the attachment patterns formed in the formative years of an individual's life might serve as the basis for adult attachment. Being rejected is a painful experience that children learn about.

When someone feels rejected, it can cause psychological and behavioural overreactions such as animosity, depression, removal of assistance, jealousy, and inappropriate efforts to change other people's behaviour (Leary, 2015). It is crucial for someone to be able to successfully regulate their emotions utilising adaptive strategies in order to prevent this.

A basic human motivation is to form and maintain relationships with other people (DeWall et al., 2012). Attachment theory offers a solid framework for better comprehension of individual differences in adaptive functioning in adulthood. (Bowlby, 1982; Mikulincer and Shaver, 2007).

Studies looking at the role of attachment styles provide indirect support for the hypothesis that there is a connection between emotion dysregulation and sensitivity to rejection. In fact, it was shown that rejection sensitivity was related to an anxious attachment style (typically characterised by emotion dysregulation), and this impact was largely outlined by the moderating role of worry, which is essentially an ineffective way to manage emotions (Khoshkam et al. 2012).

Bowlby suggests that children create mental representations of themselves and other people that shape how they interact with others in the future. Expectations regarding whether significant people will satiate their wants or reject them are at the center of these theories. These expectations are a result of how consistently their caretaker met their needs when they were young (Cassidy, Jones & Shaver, 2013).

According to attachment theory, early emotional connections between infants and their caretakers help shape infants' mental models of their own selves and interpersonal relationships (Bretherton, 1987). Since this model is largely consistent and persists throughout adulthood, it serves as the foundation for personal and intimate relationships (Hazan and Shaver, 1987; Feeney and Noller, 1990; Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991). An infant develops a secure attachment type when they regard their caregiver as responsive, approachable, and trustworthy. However, if the primary caregiver is unpredictable, untrustworthy, or unresponsive, a poor internal functioning model and an insecure attachment may form. (Bretherton, 1987).

The attachment styles can be used to determine a person's level of rejection sensitivity and how it will affect them (Huntsinger & Luecken, 2004). Experiencing multiple rejections is likely to make people oversensitive to potential rejection and develop social information processing techniques that have lasting and prolonged negative effects, according to Bowlby's (1969) attachment theory (Downey & Feldman, 1996).

The attachment and attribution explanations of the behavioural relationship were combined to create the rejection sensitivity model. Its fundamental tenet is that early rejection experiences lead people to anticipate future rejection and develop anxiety about the potential of this type of rejection even before it takes place (Downey, Khouri, & Feldman, 1997).

According to Staebler, Helbing, Rosenbach, and Renneberg (2011), increased rejection sensitivity is linked to poor psychological and interpersonal functioning, including increased rumination and hostility (Ayduk, Gyurak, & Luerssen, 2008; Galliher & Bentley, 2010).

Canyas et al., (2010) created a dynamic, process-oriented model of rejection sensitivity. Feldman and Downey (1994) merged Michel's Cognitive Social Learning Perspective with Bowlby's Attachment Theory (1969). They claimed that early rejection experiences influence how people encode, anticipate, and value subsequent social situations, as well as how they respond to them.

A few studies have suggested that dysfunctional emotion regulation strategies could lead to high levels of rejection sensitivity in individuals (Silvers et al., 2012; Casini et al., 2021) and differences in attachment style have been associated to the regulation of emotions and the psychological functioning of an individual (Marganska et al., 2013). The ability to successfully manage one's emotions through a variety of techniques to control the feelings that one has, experiences, or expresses is known as emotion regulation (Gross, 2001).

Along the timeframe of the developing emotional reaction, there are numerous emotion regulation techniques (Gross, 2001). This model is based on an understanding of the emotion-generating process that has been developed by a number of earlier emotion theorists. Emotion strategies can be separated based on when they have the greatest influence on the emotion-generating process since emotion develops

throughout time. Actions we take prior to our behaviour and physiological responses changing as a result of the emotion response tendencies getting fully activated are referred to as antecedent-focused tactics. Reaction-focused methods describe the actions we take after an emotion has begun and after the response tendencies have been produced.

Theoretical models of adult attachment (Bowlby, 1982; Kobak & Sceery, 1988) propose that emotion regulation techniques emerge in the parent-child connection and consequently impact adult romantic attachment styles. According to prior research, it is plausible to infer that attachment insecurity throughout adolescence promotes the adoption of unhelpful emotion control techniques, which in turn encourages more insecure adult attachment styles and increases sensitivity to rejection.

Method
Tools used:

Revised Adult Attachment Scale (RAAS) (1996) was developed by Collins and it is used to measure adult attachment style dimensions including comfort with closeness and intimacy (Close subscale), comfort with depending on others (Depend subscale), and worry about being rejected or unloved (Anxiety subscale). It is an 18-item questionnaire and each item is measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (not at all characteristic of me) to 5 (very characteristic of me). The reliability was found to be = .81, .78, and .85 for close, depend and anxiety respectively. The discriminatory validity was found to be good and the construct-related validity was found to be high.

Adult Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire (A-RSQ; Berenson et al., 2009) is an adaptation of the Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire by Downey & Feldman (1996). It is used for assessing the rejection sensitivity in adults. There are nine hypothetical social situations in the questionnaire, all with undetermined outcomes. Interpersonal relationships are primarily depicted in the circumstances. Each item is scored based on how concerned or anxious they are about the circumstance and how likely they think the other person is to act in their favour. The reliability was found to be = .86.

Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ) (2003) was developed by Gross & John. It is used to measure the respondents' tendency to regulate their emotions in two ways. This questionnaire consists 10 items designed to measure the two dimensions: Cognitive reappraisal and Expressive suppression. Respondents' answers are scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The reliability was found to be = .89-.90 for the cognitive reappraisal subscale and = .76-.80 for the expressive suppression subscale. The construct validity was found to be good.

Results and Discussion

Table 1 Difference in Rejection Sensitivity based on Gender

Variable	Male (150)		Female (151)		t	p
	M	SD	M	SD		
Rejection Sensitivity	9.74	2.738	9.58	3.116	0.48	0.628

Note. Mean parameter values for each of the analyses are shown for males (n = 150) and females (n = 151), as well as the results of t tests (assuming equal variance) comparing the parameter estimates between the two groups.

Table 1 displays the difference in rejection sensitivity based on gender. The results indicate that there is no significant difference in rejection sensitivity on the basis of gender.

A study done by Sarisoy (2017) found a similar result that indicated no gender-based difference in rejection sensitivity.

Thus, H01 which states that there will be no significant difference in rejection sensitivity based on gender is accepted.

Table 2 Difference in Emotion Regulation based on Gender

Emotion Regulation	Male (150)		Female (151)		t	p
	M	SD	M	SD		
Reappraisal	4.74	1.138	4.89	1.030	1.179	0.239
Suppression	4.70	1.263	4.43	1.304	1.822	0.069

Note. Mean parameter values for each of the analyses are shown for males (n = 150) and females (n = 151), as well as the results of t tests (assuming equal variance) comparing the parameter estimates between the two groups.

Table 2 displays the difference in emotion regulation based on gender. The results indicate that there is no significant difference in emotion regulation on the basis of gender. These results are contradictory to previous studies (Gross & John, 2003; Sarisoy, 2017) which found a significant difference in emotion regulation on the basis of gender. Thus, H02 which states that there will be no significant difference in emotion regulation based on gender is accepted.

Table 3 Difference in Rejection Sensitivity based on Relationship Status

Variable	Single (247)		Committed (54)		t	p
	M	SD	M	SD		
Rejection Sensitivity	9.77	2.906	9.13	3.010	1.465	0.144

Note. Mean parameter values for each of the analyses are shown for the single (n = 247) and the committed (n = 54) individuals, as well as the results of t tests (assuming equal variance) comparing the parameter estimates between the two groups.

Table 3 displays the difference in rejection sensitivity based on relationship status. The results indicate that there is no significant difference in rejection sensitivity on the basis of the relationship status of the participants. These findings are supported by a previous study (Nowland et al., 2018) which also found no significant difference in rejection sensitivity based on relationship status in a younger group (18-35 years) of participants. Thus, H03 which states that there will be no significant difference in rejection sensitivity based on relationship status is accepted.

Table 4 Difference in Emotion Regulation based on Relationship Status

Emotion Regulation	Single (247)		Committed (54)		t	p
	M	SD	M	SD		
Reappraisal	4.85	1.085	4.65	1.084	1.240	0.216
Suppression	4.59	1.284	4.44	1.313	0.757	0.450

Note. Mean parameter values for each of the analyses are shown for the single (n = 247) and the committed (n = 54) individuals, as well as the results of t tests (assuming equal variance) comparing the parameter estimates between the two groups.

Table 4 displays the difference in emotion regulation based on relationship status. The results indicate that there is no significant difference in emotion regulation on the basis of the relationship status of the participants.

These findings are contradictory to a previous study (Marroquin & Nolen-Hoeksema, 2015) which found that

individuals in relationships displayed lower use of maladaptive emotion regulation strategies. Thus, H04 which states that there will be no significant difference in emotion regulation based on relationship status is accepted.

Table 5 Descriptive Statistics and Correlation for Attachment Styles and Rejection Sensitivity

Variables	n	M	SD	1	2	3	4
1. Close Attachment	301	3.26	0.729	-	0.47**	-0.13*	-0.21*
2. Depend Attachment	301	12.95	1.441	0.47*	-	-	-
3. Anxiety Attachment	301	3.24	1.052	-0.13*	0.40*	-	-
4. Rejection Sensitivity	301	9.66	2.930	0.21*	-0.18*	0.09	-

*p < .05. **p < .01

Table 5 shows the correlation between different attachment styles and rejection sensitivity. From the above table, it is evident that close attachment style has a significant negative correlation with rejection sensitivity (r = -0.21). The results also reveal a significant negative correlation between depend attachment style and rejection sensitivity (r = -0.18). This indicates that individuals with close and depend attachment styles pattern will be lower in rejection sensitivity. These findings are supported by various studies (Ishaq & Haque, 2015; Khoshkam et al., 2012; Natarajan et al., 2011; Erozkan, 2009) which found a significant negative correlation between secure attachment and rejection sensitivity. Thus, H05a and H05b which state that there is no significant relationship between close and depend attachment styles and rejection sensitivity is rejected.

Table 6 Descriptive Statistics and Correlation for Rejection Sensitivity and Emotion Regulation

Variables	n	M	SD	1	2	3
1. Rejection Sensitivity	301	9.66	2.930	-	-	-
2. Reappraisal	301	4.81	1.086	-0.13*	-	0.26**
3. Suppression	301	4.56	1.288	0.02	0.26	-

Note. *p < .05. **p < .01

Table 6 shows the correlation between different emotion regulation strategies and rejection sensitivity. From the above table, it is evident that rejection sensitivity has a significant negative correlation with reappraisal dimension of emotion regulation (r = -0.13). This indicates individuals who use less reappraisal to regulate their emotions will have higher levels of rejection sensitivity. These findings are in line with previous studies (Hafner et al., 2018; Sarisoy, 2017; Velotti et al., 2015; Kross et al., 2007) which suggested that individuals who are more sensitive to rejection have trouble regulating their emotions. Thus, H06a which states that there is no significant relationship between rejection sensitivity and reappraisal is rejected.

Table 7 Descriptive Statistics and Correlation for Attachment Styles and Emotion Regulation

Variables	n	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1. Close Attachment	301	3.26	0.729	-	-	-	-	-
2. Depend Attachment	301	12.95	1.441	0.47**	-	0.40*	0.44*	0.21*
3. Anxiety Attachment	301	3.24	1.052	-0.13*	0.40*	-	-0.03	0.16*
4. Reappraisal	301	4.81	1.086	0.09	0.44*	-0.03	-	0.26*
5. Suppression	301	4.56	1.288	-0.02	0.21*	0.16*	0.26*	-

*p < .05. **p < .01

Table 7 shows the correlation between different attachment styles and emotion regulation strategies. From the above table, it is evident that depend attachment style has a significant positive correlation with reappraisal (r = 0.44) and suppression (r = 0.21). The results also reveal a significant positive correlation between anxiety attachment style and suppression (r = 0.16). This indicates that individuals with depend attachment style pattern will be using reappraisal and suppression as emotion regulation strategies. However, individuals with anxiety attachment style pattern will be using more of suppression as their emotion regulation strategy. These findings are supported by various studies (Marganska et al., 2013; Bigdeli et al., 2013; Karreman & Vingerhoets, 2012) that discovered that a significant positive correlation was found between secure attachment style and cognitive reappraisal and insecure attachment patterns were linked to higher emotion dysregulation. Thus, H07c which states that there is no significant relationship between depend attachment and reappraisal is rejected. H07d which states that there is no significant relationship between depend attachment and suppression is rejected. H07f which states that there is no significant relationship between anxiety attachment and suppression is rejected.

Table 8 Regression Coefficients of Attachment Styles on Rejection Sensitivity

Independent Variable	R ²	B	SE	t	p	
Constant		14.90	1.48			
Close Attachment	0.07	-0.36	0.27	-0.90	-1.29	0.195
Depend Attachment	0.07	-0.42	0.15	-0.21	-2.79	0.006*
Anxiety Attachment	0.07	0.54	0.18	0.16	2.43	0.015*

Note. N=301. The impact of attachment styles on rejection sensitivity
*p < .05.

Table 8 shows the multiple regression to predict rejection sensitivity based on attachment styles. A significant regression equation was found (F (3, 297) = 7.800, p < .000, with an R² of .073. The result indicates that depend attachment and anxiety attachment have a significant influence on rejection sensitivity and hence are significant predictors of rejection sensitivity. 7% of variance in rejection sensitivity is explained by depend and anxiety attachment style patterns. These findings are supported by previous literature (Erozkan, 2009) which found that attachment styles have a significant effect on rejection sensitivity. Thus, H08 which states that there is no significant influence of attachment styles on rejection sensitivity is rejected.

Conclusion

The study examines the relationship between attachment styles, rejection sensitivity, and emotion regulation in young adults. Results show a significant relationship between attachment styles and rejection sensitivity, with attachment styles found to influence rejection sensitivity. Attachment styles including close attachment, depend attachment and anxiety attachment were assessed and it was found that depend attachment style and emotion regulation, anxiety attachment style and suppression dimension of emotion regulation and between rejection sensitivity and reappraisal dimension of emotion regulation had a significant relationship. The study also found that attachment styles can predict rejection sensitivity levels.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmad, R., & Hassan, S. A. (2014). Reliability analysis of the Revised Adult Attachment Scale (RAAS) instrument in the Malaysian context. Social

Sciences, 77, 29098-29100.

2. Aldao, A., Nolen-Hoeksema, S., & Schweizer, S. (2010). Emotion-regulation strategies across psychopathology: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical psychology review*, 30(2), 217-237.
3. Bartholomew, K., & Perlman, D. (1994). Attachment process in adulthood. London: Kingsley Publication.
4. Bartholomew, K., and Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: a test of a four-category model. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 61, 226-244. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.61.2.226>
5. Berenson, K. R., Gyurak, A., Ayduk, Ö., Downey, G., Garner, M. J., Mogg, K., Bradley, B.P., & Pine, D. S. (2009). Rejection sensitivity and disruption of attention by social threat cues. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43, 1064-1072. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2009.07.007>
6. Bowlby, J. (1973). Attachment and Loss: Vol. 2. Separation: Anxiety and Anger. New York, NY: Basic Books.
7. Bowlby, J. (1982). Attachment and loss: Retrospect and prospect. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 52(4), 664-678. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-0025.1982.tb01456.x>
8. Bretherton, I. (1985). Attachment theory: Retrospect and prospect. In I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.), *Growing points of attachment theory and research: Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 50 (1-2, Serial No. 209), 3-35.
9. Bretherton, I. (1987). "New perspectives on attachment relations: security, communication, and internal working models," in *Wiley Series on Personality Processes: Handbook of Infant Development*, ed. J. D. Osofsky (Oxford: John Wiley & Sons), 1061-1100.
10. Casini, E., Glemser, C., Premoli, M., Preti, E., & Richetin, J. (2021). The mediating role of emotion regulation strategies on the association between rejection sensitivity, aggression, withdrawal, and prosociality. *Emotion*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000908>
11. Cassidy, J. (2008). Emotion regulation: influences of attachment relationships. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 59(2-3), 228-249. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5834.1994.tb01287.x>
12. Cooper, L. M., Shaver, P. R., & Collins, N. L. (1998). Attachment styles, emotion regulation, and adjustment in adolescence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1380-1397.
13. Cutuli, D. (2014). Cognitive reappraisal and expressive suppression strategies role in the emotion regulation: an overview on their modulatory effects and neural correlates. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnys.2014.00175>
14. 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.), *Developmental perspectives on trauma: Rochester Symposium on Developmental Psychology*, 8. (pp. 85-114). University of Rochester Press, Rochester, New York
15. Downey, G., Mougios, V., Ayduk, O., London, B. E., & Shoda, Y. (2004). Rejection sensitivity and the defensive motivational system: Insights from the startle response to rejection cues. *Psychological Science*, 15, 668-673. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00738.x>
16. Erozkan, A. (2009). Rejection sensitivity levels with respect to attachment styles, gender, and parenting styles: A study with Turkish students. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 37(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2009.37.1.1>
17. Feeney, J. A., and Noller, P. (1990). Attachment style as a predictor of adult romantic relationships. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 58, 281-291. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2018.01.010>
18. Feldman, S., & Downey, G. (1994). Rejection sensitivity as a mediator of the impact of childhood exposure to family violence on adult attachment behavior. *Development and Psychopathology*, 6(1), 231-247. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400005976>
19. Gillath, O., Bunge, S. A., Shaver, P. R., Wendelken, C., & Mikulincer, M. (2005). Attachment-style differences in the ability to suppress negative thoughts: Exploring the neural correlates. *NeuroImage*, 28(4), 835-847. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2005.06.kh>
20. Griffin, D. W., & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Metaphysics of measurement: The case of adult attachment. In K. Bartholomew & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Advances in personal relationships*, Vol. 5: Attachment processes in adulthood (pp. 17-52). London: Kingsley Publication.
21. Gross, J. J. (1998). Antecedent- and response-focused emotion regulation: Divergent consequences for experience, expression, and physiology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 224-237
22. Hafner, N., Pepping, C. A., & Wertheim, E. H. (2018). Dispositional mindfulness, rejection sensitivity, and behavioural responses to rejection: The role of emotion regulation. *Australian Journal of Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajpy.12224>
23. Hazan, C., and Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 52, 511-524. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.52.3.511>
24. Kerns, K. A., Abraham, M. M., Schlegelmilch, A., & Morgan, T. A. (2007). Mother-child attachment in later middle childhood: Assessment approaches and associations with mood and emotion regulation. *Attachment & Human Development*, 9(1), 33-53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616730601151441>
25. 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. <https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v8i3.46310.5964/ejop.v8i3.463>
26. Lakey, B., & Cronin, A. (2008). Low social support and major depression: Research, theory and methodological issues. In K. S. Dobson & D. J. A. Dozois (Eds.), *Risk factors in depression* (pp. 385-408). New York, NY: Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-045078-0.00017-4>
27. Main, M., & Goldwyn, R. (1994). Adult attachment rating and classification system, manual in draft, Version 6.0. Unpublished manuscript. Berkeley: University of California.
28. Marganska, A., Gallagher, M., & Miranda, R. (2013). Adult attachment, emotion dysregulation, and symptoms of depression and generalized anxiety disorder. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 83(1), 131-141. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajop.12001>
29. Mikulincer, M., Shaver, P. R., & Pereg, D. (2003). Attachment theory and affect regulation: The dynamics, development, and cognitive consequences of attachment-related strategies. *Motivation and Emotion*, 27, 77-102.
30. Natarajan, G., Somasundaram, C. P., & Sundaram, K. R. (2011). Relationship between Attachment Security and Rejection Sensitivity in Early Adolescence. *Psychological Studies*, 56(4), 378-386. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12646-011-0108-8>
31. Nowland, R., Talbot, R., & Qualter, P. (2018). Influence of loneliness and rejection sensitivity on threat sensitivity in romantic relationships in young and middle-aged adults. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 131, 185-190. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.04.047>
32. Ochsner, K., & Gross, J. (2005). The cognitive control of emotion. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 9 (5), 242-249. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2005.03.010>
33. Rimé, B. (2009). Emotion elicits the social sharing of emotion: Theory and empirical review. *Emotion Review*, 1, 60 - 85. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1754073908097189>
34. Romero-Canyas, R., Downey, G., Berenson, K., Ayduk, O., & Kang, N. J. (2010). Rejection Sensitivity and the Rejection-Hostility Link in Romantic Relationships. *Journal of Personality*, 78(1), 119-148. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2009.00611.x>
35. Rosenbach, C. (2014). Rejection Sensitivity-etiological aspects and psychopathological impact (Doctoral dissertation).
36. Sandstrom, M. J., Cillessen, A. H., & Eisenhower, A. (2003). Children's appraisal of peer rejection experiences: Impact on social and emotional adjustment. *Social Development*, 12, 530-550
37. Sansoy, G. (2017). Personality disorders in relation to early childhood experiences, rejection sensitivity, and emotion regulation processes. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
38. Staebler, K., Helbing, E., Rosenbach, C., & Renneberg, B. (2011). Rejection sensitivity and borderline personality disorder. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, 18(4), 275-283.
39. Thompson, R. A. & Calkins, S. D. (1996). The double-edged sword: Emotional regulation for children at risk. *Development and Psychopathology*, 8, 163-182.
40. Thompson, R. A. (1994). Emotion regulation: a theme in search of definition. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 59, 2/3, 25-52.
41. Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J., & Nesdale, D. (2013). Anxious and angry rejection sensitivity, social withdrawal, and retribution in high and low ambiguous situations. *Journal of Personality*, 81(1), 29-38. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2012.00792.x>