

REJECTION SENSITIVITY, RESILIENCE AND MARITAL ATTITUDE IN YOUNG ADULTS SEEKING MARRIAGE PROPOSALS

Nazia Umer^{a*}, & Dr. Hira Jahangier^b

^a MS Scholar, Department of Clinical Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, The Superior University, Lahore, Pakistan. Email: su-94-mscpw-f24-085@superior.edu.pk, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-9730-3532>

^b Lecturer, Higher Education Department, Government of Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan. Email: hirabutt411@gmail.com

*Correspondence to: Ms. Nazia Umer, MS Scholar, Department of Clinical Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, The Superior University, Lahore, Pakistan. E-mail: su-94-mscpw-f24-085@superior.edu.pk ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-9730-3532>

KEYWORDS:

Interpersonal Rejection Sensitivity, Resilience, Marital Attitude, Young Adults, Marriage Proposals

CITE THIS ARTICLE:

Umer, N., & Jahangier, H. (2026). Rejection sensitivity, resilience and marital attitude in young adults seeking marriage proposals. Pakistan Journal of Positive Psychology, 3(8), 196-205.

ABSTRACT

The present study examined the relationship between interpersonal rejection sensitivity, resilience, and marital attitudes among young adults seeking marriage proposals. The study also investigated whether interpersonal rejection sensitivity and resilience significantly predicted marital attitudes and whether differences existed between men and women. A correlational research design was employed, and data were collected through a non-probability purposive sampling technique from (N=150) young adults. Participants completed measures assessing Rejection sensitivity questionnaire (Downey & Feldman, 1996), Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC) and Marital Attitude Scale. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, Pearson product-moment correlation, simple linear regression, and independent-samples t-tests. The findings indicated that interpersonal rejection sensitivity was not significantly related to overall marital attitude, although small positive associations were observed with the respect and meaning dimensions. Resilience was also not significantly associated with overall marital attitude, while a small negative association was observed with romance. Regression analyses further showed that neither interpersonal rejection sensitivity nor resilience significantly predicted marital attitude. Gender comparisons revealed no significant differences between men and women in interpersonal rejection sensitivity or resilience. However, a significant gender difference was found in overall marital attitude, with women reporting more favorable attitudes toward marriage than men. Significant gender differences were also observed in the respect, trust, and financial dimensions of marital attitudes. Overall, the findings suggest that general interpersonal rejection sensitivity and resilience may not independently explain marital attitudes among young adults seeking marriage proposals. Instead, marital attitudes may be influenced by broader interpersonal, cultural, familial, and gender-related factors. The findings highlight the importance of considering relationship expectations, cultural norms, and specific dimensions of marital attitudes in premarital counseling and future research.

I. INTRODUCTION

Marriage is a major social institution associated with companionship, emotional support, family formation, and social stability. Attitudes toward marriage develop before marriage and reflect individuals' beliefs, expectations, values, and evaluations concerning its desirability, timing, permanence, and role in life. Willoughby et al. (2015) conceptualized marital attitudes through six interrelated dimensions: marital salience, timing, context, processes, permanence, and centrality. These dimensions indicate that individuals differ not only in their desire to marry but

also in how they understand and anticipate marital life. Marital attitudes develop from adolescence through emerging adulthood, a period characterized by identity exploration, increasing autonomy, and the formation of intimate relationships (Arnett, 2000). Family experiences are particularly influential. From a social learning perspective, individuals develop relationship expectations partly by observing parental relationships and family interactions (Bandura, 1977). Supportive and stable family environments may promote positive marital expectations, whereas parental conflict, divorce, or instability may contribute to less favorable beliefs about marriage (Cui & Fincham, 2010). Attachment experiences also shape expectations of intimacy and commitment; secure attachment is generally associated with greater relationship confidence and commitment, whereas insecure attachment may be associated with relationship anxiety, avoidance, and uncertainty (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2016).

Young adulthood is particularly important for marital attitude formation because individuals increasingly evaluate marriage in relation to personal goals, education, financial circumstances, family expectations, and previous relationship experiences. Positive marital attitudes may facilitate commitment, constructive communication, and relationship investment, whereas negative attitudes may be associated with uncertainty regarding commitment and less favorable expectations of marital life (Willoughby et al., 2015). Accordingly, understanding marital attitudes among young adults is important for examining psychological factors that influence relationship development and marriage-related decision-making. Rejection sensitivity (RS) refers to the tendency to anxiously expect, readily perceive, and intensely react to interpersonal rejection (Downey & Feldman, 1996). It involves cognitive, emotional, and behavioral processes through which individuals become particularly vigilant to potential rejection and may interpret ambiguous social cues as evidence of exclusion. These processes can contribute to emotional distress, interpersonal conflict, and difficulties in developing and maintaining close relationships (Romero-Canyas et al., 2010). According to the Rejection Sensitivity Model, repeated experiences of rejection can create expectations that future interpersonal interactions will result in rejection. When such expectations are activated, individuals may experience anxiety, sadness, anger, or hostility and may respond through withdrawal, reassurance-seeking, or defensive behavior (Downey & Feldman, 1996). These responses can negatively influence subsequent interpersonal interactions and potentially reinforce rejection-related expectations (Ayduk et al., 2008).

High rejection sensitivity has been associated with depression, anxiety, loneliness, low self-esteem, emotional dysregulation, social withdrawal, and interpersonal difficulties (London et al., 2007; Romero-Canyas et al., 2010). In romantic relationships, rejection-sensitive individuals may display heightened reassurance-seeking, jealousy, fear of abandonment, and sensitivity to relationship threats. These patterns may contribute to communication difficulties, conflict, and lower relationship satisfaction (Downey et al., 1998). Resilience refers to the capacity to maintain or regain adaptive psychological functioning when confronted with adversity, stress, trauma, or significant life challenges. Contemporary perspectives conceptualize resilience as a dynamic process rather than a fixed personality trait, resulting from interactions among individual characteristics, relationships, and environmental resources (Luthar et al., 2000; Masten, 2001). This perspective emphasizes adaptive functioning rather than simply the absence of psychological symptoms. The study of resilience emerged from developmental research demonstrating that some individuals maintain positive functioning despite substantial adversity. Werner and Smith (1982) identified protective personal and environmental factors associated with positive developmental outcomes among individuals exposed to childhood risk. Masten (2001) subsequently described resilience as "ordinary magic," emphasizing the role of common adaptive systems rather than exceptional abilities. Resilience involves processes such as emotional regulation, cognitive flexibility, optimism, self-efficacy, perseverance, adaptive coping, and effective problem solving (Connor & Davidson, 2003; Southwick et al., 2014).

Protective factors contributing to resilience operate at individual, family, and community levels. Self-esteem, optimism, emotional regulation, and adaptive coping can strengthen individual resilience, while supportive relationships, family cohesion, secure attachment, social support, and access to community resources provide additional protective influences (Masten & Reed, 2002). Higher resilience has been associated with better psychological well-being and lower levels of depression, anxiety, stress, and psychological distress (Hu et al., 2015). Resilience is also relevant to interpersonal and romantic functioning. Individuals with greater resilience may be better able to regulate emotions, communicate effectively, manage conflict, and recover from relationship stress, thereby supporting healthier relationship functioning (Bradley et al., 2011). During young adulthood, these

capacities are particularly important because individuals encounter transitions involving education, employment, independence, identity development, and intimate relationships (Arnett, 2000).

Theoretical Framework

The present study examining interpersonal rejection sensitivity, resilience, and marital attitude among young adults seeking marriage proposals is grounded in an integration of several complementary psychological theories that collectively explain how individuals perceive rejection, regulate emotional responses, and form attitudes toward marriage within a socio-cultural context. The primary theoretical foundation is Rejection Sensitivity Theory proposed by Downey and Feldman (1996), which explains that individuals develop cognitive-affective processing patterns based on past experiences of rejection, particularly in close relationships. According to this theory, rejection-sensitive individuals tend to anxiously expect rejection, readily perceive ambiguous social cues as rejecting, and respond with heightened emotional reactivity such as anxiety, anger, or withdrawal. In the context of marriage proposals, this framework suggests that young adults with high rejection sensitivity are likely to interpret delays, indirect responses, or family negotiations as personal rejection, even when no explicit rejection is intended. This heightened sensitivity can negatively influence their self-perception and reduce openness to future marital opportunities, thereby shaping their marital attitudes in a more cautious, fearful, or negative direction. However, rejection sensitivity alone does not fully explain individual differences in coping; therefore, the construct of resilience is incorporated to provide a protective and adaptive perspective.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Shulman (2024) further demonstrated that rejection sensitivity measured in early adulthood predicted poorer romantic relationship quality several years later. The study reported that individuals with persistent rejection sensitivity experienced greater interpersonal insecurity and were less likely to establish satisfying long-term romantic relationships. These findings reinforce the long-term influence of rejection sensitivity on relationship development during emerging adulthood. More recently, Mishra and Allen (2023) conducted the first comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis examining rejection sensitivity and romantic relationships. Synthesizing 60 studies involving nearly 17,000 participants, they found that rejection sensitivity was consistently associated with lower relationship satisfaction, lower perceived partner satisfaction, reduced closeness, greater relationship conflict, jealousy, self-silencing behaviors, intimate partner violence, and relationship concerns. The review concluded that rejection sensitivity is a robust predictor of poorer romantic relationship functioning across diverse populations and should be considered an important psychological factor in relationship counseling and marital interventions. A longitudinal investigation by Hafen et al., (2020) found that rejection sensitivity during adolescence predicted lower-quality romantic relationships in early adulthood. Individuals whose rejection sensitivity remained elevated over time reported poorer relationship satisfaction, lower commitment, and reduced emotional intimacy. These findings suggest that rejection sensitivity is relatively stable across development and has long-term implications for intimate relationship quality.

In relation to romantic relationships, Karney and Bradbury (2020) highlighted that resilience-related characteristics contribute significantly to relationship stability and marital satisfaction. Couples who demonstrate emotional regulation, effective coping, and adaptability are more capable of managing interpersonal conflicts and maintaining relationship quality during stressful periods. These findings suggest that resilience may influence not only individual adjustment but also relationship outcomes. Recently Pakistani researchers have given immense consideration to study the said variables like Asad and Majeed (2025) investigated rejection sensitivity, urgency, and interpersonal difficulties among 350 Pakistani young adults enrolled in universities in Lahore. The findings demonstrated that higher rejection sensitivity was significantly associated with greater interpersonal difficulties and emotional impulsivity. Rejection sensitivity also significantly predicted interpersonal problems after controlling for demographic variables. The authors concluded that interventions targeting rejection sensitivity may improve emotional regulation and interpersonal functioning among Pakistani youth. Similarly, Yousaf and Khan (2021) examined resilience and mental health among Pakistani young adults and reported that resilience significantly predicted lower levels of anxiety and depressive symptoms. The findings suggested that strengthening resilience may improve psychological adjustment among young individuals experiencing stressful life

circumstances. A study conducted by Zia and Batool (2015) among Pakistani university students found that resilience was positively associated with psychological well-being and negatively related to psychological distress. The researchers highlighted that resilient students demonstrated better emotional regulation and coping abilities when facing academic and social challenges. Qadir et al. (2013) found that family functioning and interpersonal relationships significantly influence psychological adjustment among Pakistani young adults. The findings suggested that supportive family environments promote healthier relationship expectations, whereas family conflicts may contribute to emotional difficulties and negative interpersonal beliefs. Rhoades et al. (2012) examined the relationship between premarital experiences and later relationship outcomes. The findings suggested that individuals' beliefs and attitudes before marriage influence relationship quality after marriage. Positive premarital attitudes, realistic expectations, and commitment readiness were associated with greater marital satisfaction, whereas negative expectations predicted relationship difficulties.

Rationale of the Study

Marriage is an important developmental milestone in young adulthood, and the process of seeking marriage proposals may involve rejection, uncertainty, and interpersonal evaluation that influence emotional well-being and marital attitudes. Individuals high in rejection sensitivity tend to anxiously expect and intensely respond to rejection, potentially contributing to less favorable relationship expectations (Downey & Feldman, 1996; Romero-Canyas et al., 2010). In contrast, resilience may help individuals cope adaptively with interpersonal setbacks, regulate emotions, and maintain positive expectations despite adversity (Masten, 2001; Southwick et al., 2014). Although rejection sensitivity, resilience, and marital attitudes have been studied independently, limited research has examined their combined relationship, particularly among young adults in Pakistan, where family and cultural factors strongly influence marriage decisions. Moreover, under this study phenomena recent research study much more attention to role of rejection sensitivity in marital context. Therefore, the present study examines the relationships among rejection sensitivity, resilience, and marital attitudes among young adults seeking marriage proposals, with the aim of enhancing understanding of psychological factors associated with marriage-related expectations and decision-making.

Objectives

1. To examine the relationship between Interpersonal rejection sensitivity, resilience and marital attitude among young adults seeking marriage proposals.
2. To find out how Interpersonal rejection sensitivity, and resilience significantly predicts marital attitude among young adults seeking marriage proposals.
3. To analyze gender differences in interpersonal rejection sensitivity, resilience, and marital attitude among young adults seeking marriage proposals.

Hypotheses

- H1: There would be significant relationship between interpersonal rejection sensitivity, resilience and marital attitude among young adults seeking marriage proposals.
- H2: Interpersonal rejection sensitivity and resilience would significantly predict marital attitude among young adults seeking marriage proposals.
- H3: There would be significant gender differences in interpersonal rejection sensitivity, resilience, and marital attitude among young adults seeking marriage proposals.

III. METHOD

Participants

The study employed a quantitative correlational research design to examine the relationships among interpersonal rejection sensitivity, resilience, and marital attitudes among young adults seeking marriage proposals. A sample of N=150 men and women participants aged 20–30 years was recruited through non-probability purposive sampling. Inclusion criteria those Participants were eligible who were unmarried and actively seeking marriage proposals, whereas married or divorced individuals and those with diagnosed severe psychological disorders were excluded.

Measures

[I] The Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire (RSQ) was developed by Downey and Feldman (1996) to assess individuals' tendency to anxiously anticipate, expect, and respond sensitively to interpersonal rejection. The original questionnaire consists of 18-items interpersonal situations, with two questions for each situation, resulting in 36 responses. It measures two components of rejection sensitivity: anxiety or concern about possible rejection and expectations of acceptance from others. Participants respond to each question using a six-point Likert-type scale. For anxiety, responses range from 1 (very unconcerned) to 6 (very concerned), while acceptance expectancy ranges from 1 (very unlikely) to 6 (very likely). Downey and Feldman (1996) reported an internal consistency coefficient of Cronbach's $\alpha=.83$. **[II]** The Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC) is a 25-item self-report instrument designed to measure psychological resilience, defined as the ability to cope with stress and adversity. Respondent's rate items on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0 ("not true at all") to 4 ("true nearly all the time"). The original scale demonstrated excellent internal consistency reliability, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.89 (Connor & Davidson, 2003). **[III]** The Marital Attitude Scale (MAS) is a standardized self-report instrument designed to assess individuals' beliefs, feelings, and readiness toward marriage. The Marital Scale consists of 23 items evaluated on a 7-point Likert scale (scored 0 to 6). The 23 items are structurally divided into six distinct factor subscales: Sense / Meaning (4 items): Measures cognitive alignment, mutual purpose, and relational understanding. *Items:* 1, 8, 10, 16. Love / Romance (3 items): Assesses expectations surrounding affection, romance, and emotional passion. *Items:* 2, 9, 15. Esteem / Respect (5 items): Measures mutual admiration, validation, and personal respect within the relationship. *Items:* 3, 11, 18, 21, 22. Faith / Trust (5 items): Evaluates expectations of fidelity, dependability, and safety. *Items:* 4, 6, 14, 17, 20. Money / Finances (3 items): Covers alignment regarding financial management, security, and economic cooperation. *Items:* 7, 13, 19. Bodily / Physical Intimacy (3 items): Measures expectations concerning sexual connection and physical closeness. *Items:* 5, 12, 23. The scale is usually based on a Likert-type response format. Reported internal consistency reliability of the scale ranges from 0.70 to 0.88, indicating acceptable to good reliability depending on the version used (Wasoughby & Hall, 2015).

Procedure

Participants were informed about the study purpose, voluntary participation, confidentiality, and their right to withdraw without penalty. Data were collected using a demographic sheet and standardized measures of rejection sensitivity, resilience, and marital attitudes, with privacy and anonymity maintained throughout the process. Completed data were securely stored and analyzed using SPSS. Cronbach's alpha was used to assess internal consistency, while Pearson product-moment correlation examined relationships among study variables and multiple regression assessed their predictive effects. Where applicable, moderation analysis using PROCESS Macro (Hayes, 2013) examined the moderating role of resilience, and independent-samples *t*-tests were used to examine gender differences. Statistical significance was set at $p < .05$.

II. RESULTS

Table I: Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N=150)

Demographic Variable	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Gender	Men	87	58.0
	Women	63	42.0
Marital Status	Single (Seeking Proposal)	103	68.7
	Engaged	39	26.0
	Previously Engaged	8	5.3
Previous Relationship Experience	No	97	64.7
	Yes	53	35.3
Number of Past Relationships	None	97	64.7
	1	30	20.0
	2–3	5	3.3
	3	11	7.3

Exposure to Rejected Marriage Proposals	More than 3	7	4.7
	No	109	72.7
Engagement Duration	Yes	41	27.3
	Not Engaged	95	63.3
	Less than 6 months	17	11.3
	6–12 months	14	9.3
	More than 1 year	24	16.0

Note. *N* = total sample size; *n* = frequency; % = percentage.

The demographic characteristics of participants (*N* = 150) indicated that the majority were men (58.0%), single and seeking marriage proposals (68.7%). Most participants reported no previous relationship experience (64.7%), while 35.3% had experienced a previous relationship. Regarding the number of past relationships, 20.0% reported one relationship, whereas smaller proportions reported two to three, three, or more than three relationships. Most participants had not experienced rejection of marriage proposals (72.7%), while 27.3% had experienced such rejection. Regarding engagement duration, 63.3% were not engaged, 11.3% had been engaged for less than six months, 9.3% for 6–12 months, and 16.0% for more than one year.

Table II: Descriptive Statistics and Internal Consistency of Study Variables (N=150)

Measure	Range		α
	Min	Max	
Interpersonal Rejection Sensitivity	18-108	20-94	.87
Resilience	0-125	10-105	.60
Marital Attitude	7-161	8-138	.92
Romance	0-21	0-18	.62
Respect	0-35	0-30	.60
Trust	0-35	0-30	.65
Finances	0-21	0-18	.64
Meaning	0-28	0-24	.69
Physical Intimacy	0-21	0-18	.63

Note. *N* = sample size; *M* = mean; *SD* = standard deviation; α = Cronbach's alpha.

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics and internal consistency of the study variables among 150 participants. Interpersonal Rejection Sensitivity demonstrated good internal consistency ($\alpha=.87$), while Marital Attitude showed excellent internal consistency ($\alpha=.92$). Resilience exhibited low reliability ($\alpha=.60$). The subscales of Marital Attitude, including Romance ($\alpha=.62$), Respect ($\alpha=.60$), Trust ($\alpha=.65$), Finances ($\alpha=.64$), Meaning ($\alpha=.69$), and Physical Intimacy ($\alpha=.63$), demonstrated relatively low internal consistency.

Table III: Descriptive Statistics and Pearson Correlations among Interpersonal Rejection Sensitivity, Resilience, and Marital Attitude Dimensions (N = 150)

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Rejection Sensitivity	32.98	9.19	-								
2. Resilience	18.23	2.18	.06	-							
3. Romance	11.32	3.99	.10	-.16*	-						
4. Respect	22.56	7.24	.18*	-.08	.90**	-					
5. Trust	20.81	6.50	.11	-.02	.92**	.66**	-				
6. Finances	10.16	3.42	.03	.03	.58**	.32**	.42**	-			
7. Meaning	15.95	6.00	.23**	.03	.89**	.62**	.83**	.76**	-		
8. Physical Intimacy	11.11	3.82	.02	-.13	.77**	.71**	.57**	.69**	.58**	-	

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 3 presents the descriptive statistics and Pearson correlations among interpersonal rejection sensitivity, resilience, and marital attitude dimensions among 150 participants. Interpersonal rejection sensitivity was positively correlated with respect ($r = .18, p < .05$) and meaning ($r = .23, p < .01$), whereas its relationships with romance, trust, finances, and physical intimacy were non-significant. Resilience was negatively correlated with romance ($r = -.16, p < .05$), while its relationships with the other marital attitude dimensions were non-significant. The marital attitude dimensions were generally positively and significantly intercorrelated, with correlations ranging from .32 to .92 ($p < .01$). The strongest correlation was between romance and trust ($r = .92, p < .01$), followed by romance and respect ($r = .90, p < .01$). Overall, rejection sensitivity showed limited positive associations with selected marital attitude dimensions, while resilience was not significantly associated with most dimensions.

Table IV: Multiple Linear Regression Predicting Marital Attitude from Interpersonal Rejection Sensitivity and Resilience among Young Adults Seeking Marriage Proposals (N = 150)

Predictor	B	SE	t	p	95% CI
Constant	70.42	10.25	6.87	< .001	[50.16, 90.68]
Interpersonal Rejection Sensitivity	0.35	0.21	1.67	.09	[-0.06, 0.76]
Resilience	0.68	0.89	0.76	.44	[-1.08, 2.44]

Note. $N = 150$. B = unstandardized regression coefficient; SE = standard error; β = standardized regression coefficient; CI = confidence interval

The multiple linear regression analysis indicates that the overall model was not statistically significant, $F(2, 147) = 1.72, p = .183$, explaining approximately 2.3% of the variance in marital attitude. Neither interpersonal rejection sensitivity ($\beta = .14, p = .097$) nor resilience ($\beta = .06, p = .448$) significantly predicted marital attitude.

Table V: Gender Differences in Interpersonal Rejection Sensitivity, Resilience, and Marital Attitude (N=150)

Variable	Men ($n = 87$) M (SD)	Women ($n = 63$) M (SD)	$t(148)$	p	95% CI
Rejection Sensitivity	33.13 (8.54)	32.78 (10.10)	0.23	.82	[-2.67, 3.36]
Resilience	18.11 (2.15)	18.38 (2.23)	-0.74	.46	[-0.98, 0.45]
Marital Attitude	87.71 (23.34)	97.70 (28.31)	-2.36	.02*	[-18.34, -1.63]
Romance	10.91 (3.71)	11.89 (4.30)	-1.49	.13	[-2.28, 0.32]
Respect	21.49 (6.71)	24.03 (7.72)	-2.14	.03*	[-4.88, -0.20]
Trust	19.80 (5.50)	22.19 (7.51)	-2.14	.03*	[-4.59, -0.18]
Finances	9.59 (2.87)	10.95 (3.94)	-2.34	.02*	[-2.53, -0.21]
Meaning	15.20 (5.76)	17.00 (6.20)	-1.83	.07	[-3.78, 0.17]
Physical Intimacy	10.72 (3.98)	11.63 (3.55)	-1.47	.14	[-2.13, 0.31]

Note. M = mean; SD = standard deviation; t = independent-samples t statistic; CI = confidence interval. $p < .05$.

Table 6 presents gender differences in interpersonal rejection sensitivity, resilience, and marital attitude. No significant gender differences were found in interpersonal rejection sensitivity or resilience ($p > .05$). However, women reported significantly higher overall marital attitude scores than men ($t(148) = -2.36, p = .02$), as well as higher scores in Respect ($p = .03$), Trust ($p = .035$), and Finances ($p = .02$). Differences in Romance, Meaning, and Physical Intimacy were non-significant ($p > .05$).

III. DISCUSSION

The present study was conducted to examine the relationships among interpersonal rejection sensitivity, resilience, and marital attitude among young adults seeking marriage proposals. The study specifically focused on whether interpersonal rejection sensitivity and resilience were associated with and predictive of individuals' attitudes toward marriage, as well as whether these variables differed according to gender. The findings provide a nuanced understanding of the psychological and interpersonal factors involved in marriage-related attitudes among young adults.

The first hypothesis proposed that as interpersonal rejection sensitivity was not significantly associated with overall marital attitude. Interestingly, the associations with specific dimensions of marital attitude were not uniformly negative. Interpersonal rejection sensitivity showed small positive associations with the dimensions of respect and meaning, whereas its relationships with romance, trust, finances, and physical intimacy were non-significant. Thus, the expected pattern that greater sensitivity to rejection would be accompanied by less favorable marital attitudes was not observed in the present sample.

Richter et al. (2024), for example, examined rejection sensitivity and emotional responses to negative interactions in romantic relationships. Their findings did not provide evidence that rejection sensitivity was associated with higher negative emotions or slower emotional recovery following negative interaction perceptions. This suggests that the implications of rejection sensitivity may depend on the specific relational outcome being examined. Similarly, Shulman and Yonatan-Leus (2024) reported that the relationship between rejection sensitivity and future romantic outcomes varied across different indicators. In their longitudinal study, rejection sensitivity was not associated with the tendency to downplay disagreements, although it was associated with several other relationship outcomes. These findings are relevant to the present study because they demonstrate that rejection sensitivity may be associated with some relational characteristics while showing little or no association with others. The Second hypothesis proposed that interpersonal rejection sensitivity and resilience would significantly predict marital attitude. The regression findings indicated that interpersonal rejection sensitivity did not significantly predict marital attitude. Although the regression coefficient was in a positive direction, the overall predictive model was no significant. Therefore, interpersonal rejection sensitivity alone did not provide sufficient explanatory power for understanding differences in marital attitudes among the participants. Recent research supports this more complex interpretation. A 2023 systematic review and meta-analysis concluded that rejection sensitivity is related to several romantic relationship difficulties, but the effects vary across relationship outcomes and participant characteristics. Koh and Kim (2020) specifically examined cognitive emotion regulation and conflict-resolution strategies as mechanisms connecting rejection sensitivity with dating relationship satisfaction, indicating that rejection sensitivity may influence relationship functioning through intervening psychological and interpersonal processes rather than acting as a simple direct predictor. Likewise, Choi and Lim (2023) examined rejection sensitivity within a broader model involving insecure attachment and romantic relationship functioning, further emphasizing that rejection sensitivity should be understood within a wider interpersonal context. Therefore, the no significant predictive effect in the current study does not necessarily imply that rejection sensitivity is irrelevant to romantic relationships; rather, its influence may be indirect, conditional, or more apparent in individuals who are already involved in romantic relationships.

The third hypothesis proposed that men and women would differ significantly in interpersonal rejection sensitivity, resilience, and marital attitude. The gender comparisons revealed no statistically significant differences between men and women in interpersonal rejection sensitivity or resilience. Men reported a mean rejection sensitivity score of 33.13, compared with 32.78 among women, and this difference was not statistically significant. Similarly, the difference in resilience between men and women was non-significant. These findings suggest that men and women in the present sample did not differ significantly in their reported levels of rejection sensitivity or resilience. The non-significant gender difference in rejection sensitivity is consistent with Richter et al. (2024), who reported comparable rejection sensitivity scores among men and women in their study of romantic relationships. Their findings offer relevant evidence that gender differences in rejection sensitivity may not emerge consistently across samples. However, this similarity should not be taken as proof that men and women never differ in rejection sensitivity. Differences may depend on sample characteristics, cultural expectations, measurement approaches, and the interpersonal situations being considered. The lack of a significant gender difference in resilience similarly indicates that the present sample did not provide sufficient evidence of a difference between men and women on this measure. Resilience may reflect coping resources and adaptive capacities that vary considerably between individuals of the same gender. Family support, prior adversity, social relationships, and access to personal and community resources may contribute to individual differences. These factors were not tested in the present study, so they should be treated as potential explanations rather than established causes of the non-significant result.

IV.CONCLUSION

The present study examined the relationship between interpersonal rejection sensitivity, resilience, and marital attitude among young adults seeking marriage proposals. The findings indicated that neither interpersonal rejection sensitivity nor resilience had a significant relationship with overall marital attitude, and neither variable significantly predicted marital attitude. Although interpersonal rejection sensitivity was positively associated with the respect and meaning dimensions, these relationships were small. Similarly, resilience showed a small negative association with romance but was not significantly related to overall marital attitude. Gender differences were not significant for interpersonal rejection sensitivity or resilience; however, women reported significantly more favorable overall marital attitudes than men, particularly regarding respect, trust, and finances. Overall, the findings suggest that marital attitudes among young adults may be influenced by broader interpersonal, familial, cultural, and contextual factors rather than by rejection sensitivity or resilience alone.

LIMITATIONS

- The study used a cross-sectional design, which prevents conclusions about causal relationships.
- The sample consisted of only 150 participants, which may limit generalizability.
- Purposive sampling may have introduced sampling bias.
- Participants were young adults seeking marriage proposals, limiting generalization to married couples or other age groups.
- The study focused primarily on rejection sensitivity and resilience and did not examine other relevant factors such as attachment style, family pressure, relationship quality, or cultural expectations.

IMPLICATIONS

- Findings can help psychologists and counselors understand psychological factors associated with marriage-related attitudes.
- Pre-marital counseling programs may address rejection concerns, relationship expectations, communication, and trust.
- Mental-health professionals can use the findings to develop relationship-readiness and premarital guidance programs.
- The study provides preliminary evidence for researchers investigating rejection sensitivity, resilience, and marital attitudes in Pakistani young adults.
- Marriage counselors may focus on specific areas such as respect, trust, financial expectations, emotional compatibility, and intimacy rather than relying only on general resilience.

FUTURE SUGGESTIONS

- Future studies should use larger and more diverse samples to improve generalizability.
- Longitudinal research should examine how rejection sensitivity and resilience influence marital attitudes over time.
- Future research should include married couples to compare pre-marital attitudes with actual marital experiences.
- Researchers should use mixed-method or qualitative approaches to explore how young adults develop expectations about marriage.
- Studies should consider testing mediation and moderation models to identify more complex pathways between rejection sensitivity, resilience, and marital attitudes.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

The author received no funding from any organizations.

V. REFERENCES

- Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55(5), 469–480. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.5.469>
- Ayduk, O., Gyurak, A., & Luerssen, A. (2008). Individual differences in the rejection-aggression link in the hot zone of rejection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(3), 431–445.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Prentice Hall.
- Bonanno, G. A. (2004). Loss, trauma, and human resilience. *American Psychologist*, 59(1), 20–28. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.1.20>
- Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: Parent-child attachment and healthy human development*. Routledge.
- Bradley, J. M., & Palmer, C. A. (2011). Resilience and relationship functioning among couples. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 25, 1–10.
- Connor, K. M., & Davidson, J. R. T. (2003). Development of a new resilience scale: The Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC). *Depression and Anxiety*, 18(2), 76–82. <https://doi.org/10.1002/da.10113>
- Cui, M., & Fincham, F. D. (2010). The differential effects of parental divorce and marital conflict on young adult romantic relationships. *Personal Relationships*, 17(3), 331–343.
- Downey, G., & Feldman, S. I. (1996). Implications of rejection sensitivity for intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(6), 1327–1343. <https://doi.org/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.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(3), 511–524.
- Hu, T., Zhang, D., & Wang, J. (2015). A meta-analysis of the trait resilience and mental health. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 76, 18–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.11.039>
- Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (1995). The longitudinal course of marital quality and stability. *Psychological Bulletin*, 118(1), 3–34.
- 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.
- Luthar, S. S., Cicchetti, D., & Becker, B. (2000). The construct of resilience: A critical evaluation and guidelines for future work. *Child Development*, 71(3), 543–562.
- Lucas, R. E., & Dyrenforth, P. S. (2006). Does the existence of social relationships matter for subjective well-being? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(2), 304–324.
- Mahoney, A. (2010). Religion in families, 1999–2009: A relational spirituality framework. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(4), 805–827.
- Masten, A. S. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 227–238.
- Masten, A. S., & Reed, M.-G. J. (2002). Resilience in development. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 74–88). Oxford University Press.
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2016). *Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics, and change* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
- 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.
- Southwick, S. M., Bonanno, G. A., Masten, A. S., Panter-Brick, C., & Yehuda, R. (2014). Resilience definitions, theory, and challenges. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology*, 5(1), 25338. <https://doi.org/10.3402/ejpt.v5.25338>
- Werner, E. E., & Smith, R. S. (1982). *Vulnerable but invincible: A longitudinal study of resilient children and youth*. McGraw-Hill.
- Willoughby, B. J., Hall, S. S., & Luczak, H. P. (2015). Marital paradigms: Identifying patterns in beliefs about marriage. *Journal of Family Issues*, 36(8), 1011–1034.