ABSTRACT

Skin-deep: Analyzing Whether Attractiveness Affects Rejection Responses in Unrequited Love

Rachel Pearce

Director: Dr. Tamara Lawrence

This study examined experiences of unrequited love by exploring the effects of attractiveness, gender, and race on rejector responses. The sample (N = 142) of Baylor undergraduates completed a survey that contained a stimulus person picture and a hypothetical scenario in which they were rejecting a would-be lover. The attractiveness, race, and gender of the stimulus pictures were manipulated to assess the emotional and behavioral responses in different conditions. As expected, attractiveness had a main effect on most of the factors, indicating that treatment of would-be lovers varies depending on attractiveness. We also found 2-way effects with race and gender, as well as attractiveness and gender. There was only one 3-way effect for attractiveness, race, and gender, related to how rude rejectors' responses were. Further, factor responses in the Basic Needs Satisfaction Scale were correlated to the emotional and behavioral responses, demonstrating the importance of considering Self-Determination Theory when analyzing how people relate to others.

APPROVED BY DIRECTOR OF HONORS THESIS:

_____

Dr. Tamara Lawrence, Department of Psychology

APPROVED BY THE HONORS PROGRAM:

_____

Dr. Andrew Wisely, Director

DATE: _____

SKIN-DEEP: ANALYZING WHETHER ATTRACTIVENESS AFFECTS REJECTION

RESPONSES IN UNREQUITED LOVE

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of

Baylor University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Honors Program

By

Rachel Pearce

Waco, Texas

May 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

In 1943, Abraham Maslow introduced the concept of achieving self-actualization, the fulfillment of full individual potential, through satisfying a hierarchy of human needs. Listed among his higher level psychological needs is the need for love and affection, a need that is both universal and powerful. According to Reis and Aron (2008), love is "a desire to enter, maintain, or expand a close, connected, and ongoing relationship with another person or entity" (p. 80). Much of psychological research related to love has not only looked to define what love is and how it works, it has also studied the importance of love in human functioning. Receiving love and affection are core aspects of belongingness, which is considered a fundamental need that is a prevailing motivation for human behavior (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). In Self-Determination Theory, relatedness within relationships is considered a basic human need that when met contributes to the functioning and well-being of a person as a whole (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Furthermore, it has been suggested that having a sense of relatedness in the development of close attachments with others has been linked with having higher health benefits (Kiecolt-Glaser & Newton, 2001). Additionally, evolutionary research has studied the ways in which passionate love serves as an evolutionary mechanism, functioning to identify partners who are attractive, thus motivating partners to stay together to rear their offspring (Reis & Aron, 2008).

Nonetheless, the benefits of love also come with difficulties. According to Maslow (1943), impeding a person's needs for love and affection can cause significant

mental health issues and distress. For example, Fisher (1992) details that complications in love relationships are related to anxiety and depression, as well as violence against oneself or others (as cited in Reis & Aron, 2008, p. 83). One of the most difficult situations people encounter in the pursuit of love is experiencing unrequited love. Unrequited love refers to situations where a "would-be lover" attempts to establish a romantic relationship with a person (the rejector) who does not wish to have a romantic relationship with them. Unrequited love occurs across all ages, but considering Erikson's (1993) psychosocial stage of "Intimacy vs. Isolation" arises during late teenage years and early adulthood, this population is most affected by unrequited love (Baumeister, Wotman, & Stillwell, 1993).

It is believed that unrequited love experiences actually occur more frequently than requited love experiences, yet there is very little empirical research evaluating how these unrequited love situations occur and are navigated (Reis & Aron, 2008). What sparse research has been done has shown that unrequited love is a difficult situation for both the would-be lovers and the rejectors; however, in society, most people focus on the experience of the would-be lover rather than the rejector, perhaps because it is believed that the would-be lover suffers more (Baumeister et al., 1993). Nevertheless, research done by Baumeister et al. (1993) has shown through first-hand accounts of unrequited love experiences that more rejectors had negative emotions (70%) than would-be lovers did (44%), and less rejectors had positive emotions (57%) than would-be lovers did (98%). It was suggested this might be because the would-be lovers had a broader range of possibilities, including happiness if the rejector accepted their offer, while the rejectors were more limited in their possibilities, and would have an unpleasant experience

2

whether they accepted the offer or not. One of the largest struggles rejectors face is coping with the guilt of hurting someone, which affects the ways they communicate rejection as they attempt to assuage their guilt (Baumeister et al., 1993; Folkes, 1982).

One of the first studies to look at the ways through which rejection is communicated was done by Folkes in 1982, and coded rejection strategies according to attributional dimensions used in categorizing achievement situations (Weiner, 1979). She discovered that rejectors prefer to give impersonal (unrelated to personal characteristics of the would-be lover), uncontrollable (not within rejector's control), and unstable (temporary) reasons for rejecting dates, even if the reasons weren't true. She also determined the concerns rejectors had relating to their communicated reasons for rejection dealt with unease with hurting the would-be lover, being presented as cruel and unfair, and restrictions of social norms.

Rowatt & Cunningham (1999) further looked at the methods through which rejection was communicated, but hypothesized that situational aspects of the unrequited scenario would influence the emotional and behavioral outcomes for the rejector. This was tested specifically through the use of hypothetical scenarios that manipulated the situational contexts of prior relationship (friend vs. stranger) and wording of a relationship offer (asking for a date vs. sexual offer) (Clark & Hatfield, 1989). Rowatt & Cunningham discovered that both prior relationships and the wording of the relationship offer affected the behaviors and emotions that rejectors experienced. Specifically, women used more hostility when they were asked for sex by a stranger. Another gender difference was shown in that men were less likely to turn down a relationship offer even when they weren't romantically attracted to a woman, a finding that was consistent with

the social evolutionary theory. From this, Rowatt & Cunningham (1999) suggested that men would be much less likely to reject a physically attractive woman compared to an unattractive woman. Thus, one of the goals of the current project will be to address the question of how a would-be lover's attractiveness affects the experience of the rejector.

This highlights another important situational factor in the communication of rejection: the attractiveness of the would-be lover. This is a sensitive factor that isn't often studied, perhaps because as Dion, Berscheid, and Walster (1972) noted "we would hate to find evidence indicating that beautiful women are better liked than homely women—somehow this seems undemocratic" (p. 286). However, the possibility that physical attractiveness affects our social interactions is an important factor to research, especially in regards to social evolutionary theory. The matching theory, which hypothesizes that in realistic situations people choose partners of similar social desirability (attractiveness) as themselves was developed from the level of aspiration theory by Walster, Aronson, Abrahams, and Rottmann (1966), and tested through an experiment that matched up couples of varying attractiveness and analyzed their ratings of each other. Contrary to the matching theory, they discovered that attractiveness of the partner was the most important factor regarding whether a subject asked their partner on another date, regardless of where the subject ranked on the attractiveness scale themselves. Furthermore, attractive dates were better liked by their partners, despite whether the attractive date exhibited any interest in their partner. These findings are consistent with the "what is beautiful is good" hypothesis, which suggests that attractive individuals are believed to have better personalities and happier lives (Dion et al., 1972). Dion et al. (1972) tested this hypothesis by seeing whether people differed in their beliefs

of trait attribution based only on seeing pictures of various people (ranging from unattractive to average to attractive). The results of their study were consistent with the hypothesis, as subjects believed that the attractive individuals in the pictures had higher rankings in social desirability of personality, occupational status, marital success, social and professional happiness, overall happiness, and likelihood of marriage, regardless of whether the subjects were the same gender as the people in the picture or not. The only situation that attractive individuals had lower rankings in was parental competence. It was thus suggested that one reason people prefer relationships with attractive individuals is that they believe that they will benefit from the advantages that attractive people are perceived to have (Dion et al., 1972).

In relation to communication, attractiveness does seem to influence a person's method of message. For example, Rosen, Johnson, Johnson, & Tesser (1973) conducted a study where they found that people were actually less willing to transmit bad news to unattractive individuals. Additionally, Folkes (1982) stated that rejectors were especially unwilling to express rejection linked to physical attractiveness or personality because they are personal, uncontrollable, and stable reasons, making them even more devastating and unfair to a would-be lover. On the other hand, the study done by Rosen et al. wasn't related to unrequited love, and the context of the situation might have a difference in the way a person responds. Since it has been seen that attractive individuals are better liked and more highly admired, it is possible they may be rejected in a different way than unattractive individuals, especially with consideration to male rejectors who might not reject an attractive would-be lover at all.

In addition, another important consideration that isn't discussed much in literature related to unrequited love is the effect of race. Historically speaking, there has always been tension regarding whether people of different races should be in relationships with each other, and reactions to being approached by a would-be lover of a different race may vary. Before the Supreme Court decision to overturn anti-miscegenation laws in 1967, people were not allowed to enter into interracial marriages, especially if it was a Caucasian and a person of any other race (Moore, 1968). Since then, there has been a steadily increasing number of interracial relationships and marriages, as evidenced by the growth of interracial marriages between 2.9% in 1990 to 10% in 2010 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1994, 2012). Yet, negative views towards interracial relationships still exist and even differ between races and generations (Field, Kimuna, & Straus, 2013). For example, students at a university with a majority African-American population were found to be less accepting of interracial relationships, while students at a university with a majority Caucasian population reported that their parents would not approve of interracial relationships (Field et al., 2013). It should be noted that this data is representative of two universities and may not apply to the population in general, but it does indicate that racial tensions in relationships still exist. Thus, James and Tuckers' 2003 statement that "knowledge of another's racial origins greatly influences the terms and manner of both the approach and content of our contacts" is particularly relevant to situations where a would-be lover is judged based on the rejector's beliefs about their race (p. 153). In alignment with this statement, Bandura (1999) believed that reactions within a social environment were largely influenced by physical characteristics, including race, before any communication had even been made. In consideration that people are

still largely analyzed by their race, and that racial tensions regarding interracial relationships still exist, it might be probable that would-be lovers of a race different from the rejectors would be rejected in a different way.

As such, this experiment seeks to determine whether there are any differences between the strategies of communicating rejection based on whether a would-be lover is attractive or not, whether the rejector is a man or a woman, and what race the would-be lover is. We hypothesize that there will be a difference in how people communicate rejection to attractive people and unattractive people. Specifically that attractive people will be rejected in a less harsh, more teasing manner, and that unattractive people will be avoided and treated more rudely. We also hypothesize that men will be more likely to accept attractive would-be lovers or reject unattractive would-be lovers than women would be. Because race has never been investigated in the context of unrequited love, we consider this an exploratory variable and we are not make any specific hypotheses regarding how it will affect rejection strategies.

Past research has utilized interdependence theory (Baumeister et al., 1993) and social evolutionary theory to explore unrequited love situations. While these theories did fit the pattern of results for each individual study, we wanted to explore the extent to which Self-Determination Theory would fit our pattern of results. Specifically, we thought communicating social rejection would be most closely related to an individual's Relatedness Needs.

CHAPTER TWO

Methods and Materials

Attractiveness Pretesting

The attractiveness ratings for the pictures used in each condition were determined in a preliminary survey. Fourteen stock photos of varying races and physical appearance were used to create a short survey that asked participants to rank the physical attractiveness and their willingness to date the people in each photo. Baylor undergraduates from Psychology courses, as well as volunteers found around campus, participated in the survey. From their responses, eight of the photos were chosen based on interrater agreement of the level of attractiveness.

Participants

There were 142 Baylor University students, 42 men and 100 women, recruited to participate in this survey. The mean age of the men was 19.29 years (*SD*= 0.995) and the mean age of the women was 19.08 years (*SD*= 1.201). The participants were principally Caucasian (66.2%), with 11.3% Asian-American, 8.5% African American, 9.9% Hispanic/Latino, and 4.2% identified themselves as Other. Looking at relationship status, the majority of participants reported being single (64.1%), with 26.8% in a serious relationship, and 9.2% dating casually. Participants were either students enrolled in any Psychology course that provided credit for research participation or volunteers recruited from the Baylor student body. If students were in a class that provided credit for research

participation, they received one credit for that class, while volunteers were not compensated.

Materials

The survey contained a demographics questionnaire concerning age, gender, race, and relationship status, as well as a hypothetical scenario that included a picture. The scenario was phrased as such:

> While out with friends one night, you see Jessica/Michael, a girl/boy who is currently in one of your classes. Although her/his face is familiar, you can only recall talking to her/him once or twice at most, and you have never expressed any feelings of attraction to or desire for her/him. Later on that night, Jessica/Michael pulls you aside and tells you, "I've seen you in class before and can't help but notice you. Would you like to go on a date with me?" You think Jessica/Michael is a nice girl/boy, but you are simply not interested in being romantically involved with her/him.

After this, the survey contained a manipulation check question designed to verify the efficacy of the pictures and scenario in conveying what they were intended to. The question read, "Based on the picture, how physically attractive is the person?" where answers were ranked on a 9-point Likert type scale (1 = not at all attractive; 9 = extremely attractive). This question was followed by dependent measures intended to assess participants' cognitive, emotional, and behavioral responses to the presented scenario.

Emotions

Participants ranked the likelihood that they would experience 40 different emotions following the scenario on a 9-point Likert type scale (1 = not at all likely; 9 = extremely likely). The emotions loaded into four factors derived from previous research by Rowatt (2011), and measured *Empathy* (sympathetic, moved, compassionate, tender,

9

warm, softhearted), *Annoyance* (impatient, disgusted, irritated, annoyed, offended, perturbed), *Personal Distress* (alarmed, grieved, upset, worried, disturbed, distressed, troubled), and *Flattered* (attractive, complimented, flattered, happy). The emotion factors all generated relatively high reliability coefficients ($\alpha_{Empathy}$ = .84; $\alpha_{Annoyance}$ = .89; $\alpha_{Personal\ Distress}$ = .85; $\alpha_{Flattered}$ = .79).

Rejection Strategies

Participants ranked the likelihood that they would engage in 35 various rejection behaviors following the scenario, and answers were ranked on a 9-point Likert type scale (1 = not at all likely; 9 = extremely likely). Behaviors were also based off of previous research by Rowatt (2011), and were factor analyzed to determine five different behavioral categories (see Table 1). The categories determined were labeled *Rude* (α = .86), *Too Different* (α = .81), *Not Now* (α = .78), *Tease* (α = .74), and *Avoid* (α = .74).

Personality

Basic Need Satisfaction. The survey included the Basic Need Satisfaction in General scale (Johnston & Finney, 2010), a reliable inventory that measures general life satisfaction based on the fulfillment of basic psychological needs. The scale is composed of 21 statements, such as "I generally feel free to express my ideas and opinions." Participants marked the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the statements using a 7-point Likert type scale (1= not at all true, 7= very true). Results were categorized into three subscales that measured Autonomy (α = .61), Competence (α = .75), and Relatedness (α = .78).

Authenticity. An authenticity inventory (AI-3; Kernis & Goldman, 2006) measuring the ways that participants viewed themselves was also included. The inventory included 45 statements related to what a person believed about themselves, for example "I find it very difficult to critically assess myself." Answers were marked on a 5-point Likert-type scale, and ranged from "1 = Strongly Disagree" to "5 = Strongly Agree." The inventory results are divided into four subscales that included *Awareness* ($\alpha = 0.79$), *Unbiased Processing* ($\alpha = 0.64$), *Behavioral* ($\alpha = 0.80$), and *Relational Orientation* ($\alpha = 0.78$). The scale as a total has a high reliability value ($\alpha = 0.90$).

Beliefs about Relationships. The survey incorporated the Relationship Belief Inventory (RBI; Eidelson & Epstein, 1982), designed to measure what dysfunctional beliefs participants held about being in relationships. The RBI consists of 40 statements regarding views on relationships, including "If my partner wants to change, I believe that s/he can do it." The extent to which participants agreed or disagreed with the statements was measured on a 6-point Likert type scale, ranging from "0 = I strongly believe that the statement is *false*" to "5 = I strongly believe that the statement is *true.*" The results of the scores were divided into five subscales, including Disagreement is destructive, Mindreading is expected, Partners cannot change, Sexual perfectionism, The sexes are different. The internal consistency scores of the five scales within the RBI were adequate, ranging from $\alpha = 0.72$ to $\alpha = 0.81$.

Attitudes on sex. Lastly, the survey had the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (SOI; Simpson & Gangestad, 1991) a psychological inventory measuring beliefs and attitudes about sex. The SOI contains 7 items total, with three different question types.

The first 3 questions were related to participants' sexual experiences, for example "With how many different partners have you had sex (sexual intercourse) in the past year?" These questions were open-response demographic questions, limited to the use of three typed characters. The fourth item was a multiple choice question that asked about the amount of times the participant fantasized about a person other than their partner, and answers ranged from "1 = never" to "8 = at least once a day." The last three items were statements related to beliefs about sex, such as "Sex without love is OK," and were ranked on a 9-point Likert-type scale (1 = I strongly disagree, 9 = I strongly agree). The SOI is widely used, and has a satisfactory internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.73$).

Procedures

Participants accessed the survey online through Baylor's SONA system in the Psychology Department. The survey consisted of a demographics section followed by one of eight possible rejection scenarios that varied by gender, attractiveness, and race to which participants were randomly assigned to which photo they would see depending on whether they were a man or woman. After this were several manipulation questions to verify that the scenarios were perceived the way they were supposed to be, as well as several questions analyzing the how comfortable the participants felt and their likelihood of engaging in future actions related to the scenario. The participants also reported emotional and behavioral responses, and filled out several personality inventories.

CHAPTER THREE

Results

The purpose of this study was to determine whether attractiveness, race of a would-be lover, or gender had an effect on the rejection experience from the standpoint of the rejector. This was determined by analyzing the emotions felt by the rejector following the experience of rejecting the would-be lover, as well as the strategies used for communicating rejection.

Behaviors

We examined the probability that rejection strategies would be used by asking our participants to rate the likelihood they would utilize 35 rejection strategies. To determine our behavioral factors, we conducted a principle component factor analysis with varimax rotation, and extracted five factors (see Table 1 for Factors and Factor loadings). The first factor, labeled *Rude*, included five items considered unkind or offensive, such as "Tell the person they are unattractive." The second factor was designated *Too Different*, and the five behaviors that loaded into this factor involved the rejector telling the would-be lover that they were too dissimilar to be compatible (e.g., "Say that you both want different things") or that their actions were inappropriate (e.g., "Tell the person their actions make you uncomfortable"). The third factor was branded *Not Now*; the five items in this factor suggested that the timing wasn't right, but that the conditions weren't necessarily permanent (e.g., "Say that you have no time for a relationship"). The fourth factor was labeled *Tease*, and the four items that loaded into this factor appeared to

encourage the affections and interest of the would-be lovers, for example "Give them a compliment." Lastly, the fifth factor was dubbed *Avoid*, and contained three items that indicated a desire to evade directly communicating rejection (e.g.. Say nothing to the person").

Race and relationship status of the participants

The race of the participants did not appear to have a significant effect on the attractiveness ratings of the conditions, nor on the Emotional and Behavioral factors. While it is possible that the race of the participant may have influenced the choice of rejection for would-be lovers of races different than their own, we did not have sufficient numbers or racial variety to test these hypotheses. In order to avoid losing statistical power, we kept data for all of the races, but did not consider the race of the participant as an independent variable. Nonetheless, this would make an interesting topic of research for future study on unrequited love and rejection.

The relationship statuses of the participants affected the use of *Not Now* and *Tease* rejection strategies; $F(2, 140) = 12.13$, $p < 0.001$ and $F(2, 139) = 4.79$ respectively. That is, participants in a committed relationship were more likely to use the *Not Now* strategy and significantly less likely to *Tease*. However, despite these effects, we included them in the data analysis to avoid losing statistical power. For future research, the relationship status of the participants might be an important variable to consider when analyzing how rejection is conveyed in unrequited love situations.

Table 1. Behavioral Rejection Strategy Factor Analysis

	Rude	Too Diff.	Not Now	Tease	Avoid
Tell the person they have poor grooming	.85				
Tell the person they are unattractive	.84				
Accept the date, but don't show up	.84				
Tell them you feel uncomfortable dating someone of their ethnicity	.66				
Give them a look of annoyance	.63				
Say that the relationship just wouldn't work		.75			
Say that you are incompatible with each other		.75			
Say that you both want different things		.75			
Tell the person their actions make you uncomfortable		.64			
Say you don't think it is appropriate for them to ask you out		.57			
Say you like playing the field and don't want to settle down with one person			.81		
Say you just got out of a relationship or just got divorced			.71		
Say the timing isn't right			.67		
Say that you have no time for a relationship			.50		
Say that you wouldn't want a long distance relationship			.49		
Give them a compliment				.69	
Flirt with them				.65	
Give them your phone number				.77	
Wouldn't reject, but accept offer even if I wasn't interested in a romantic relationship				.68	
Avoid the person					.82
Say nothing to the person					.79
Have your friend tell the person you aren't interested					.74

Manipulation check

Analyzing the results gathered from the question following the unrequited love scenarios in the survey, it is evident that the manipulation of attractiveness between the stimulus person pictures was significant and effectual. The stimulus person pictures used in the attractive condition were rated as more attractive on a 9-point scale ($M = 6.66$, $SD = 1.045$) than the pictures used in the unattractive condition ($M = 2.66$, $SD = 1.296$), $t(140) = 20.3$, $p < .001$.

Likelihood of Accepting Would-be lover

When looking at the participants' choice to accept or reject the would-be lover, we found no interaction effects between gender and attractiveness. However, we did find significant singular effects for both attractiveness and gender. Unsurprisingly, participants were more likely to accept attractive would-be lovers ($M = 4.91$, $SD = 2.44$) than unattractive would-be lovers ($M = 3.04$, $SD = 1.98$), $F(1, 137) = 23.25$; $p < 0.000$. Surprisingly, women were more likely to accept would-be lovers ($M = 4.20$, $SD = 2.27$) than men were ($M = 3.33$, $SD = 2.58$), $F(1, 137) = 5.19$; $p = 0.024$.

Frequency of Behavioral and Emotional Factors

Within the rejection behavior factors (ranked on a 9-point scale with higher scores indicating more likely to use), *Avoid* was the most common factor ($M = 4.31$, $SD = 2.09$), followed by *Not Now* ($M = 3.80$, $SD = 1.96$), *Tease* ($M = 3.36$, $SD = 1.83$), *Too Different* ($M = 3.31$, $SD = 1.87$), and *Rude* ($M = 1.58$, $SD = 1.19$). With regards to the emotion factors, *Flattered* was the most common factor ($M = 6.44$, $SD = 1.55$), followed by *Empathy* ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 1.74$), *Personal Distress* ($M = 2.95$, $SD = 1.58$), and

Annoyance (*M* = 2.16, *SD* = 1.44). It should be noted that since factors did not have an

equal number of items loading into each one, the data reflects a manipulation to account

for this.

Interaction effects

Although the main focus of this study was analyzing whether attractiveness

significantly affected the rejection process, our overall goal was to examine the effects

and interactions of attractiveness, race, and gender. We conducted a univariate analysis of

variance for each emotional and behavioral factor that analyzed the singular effects and

2- and 3-way interactions of attractiveness (would-be lover), race (would-be lover), and

gender (rejector). We found one significant three-way interaction for these variables

within the *Rude* rejection factor (see Table 2). Our post hoc contrasts indicated that the

mean for use of *Rude* behaviors to reject the unattractive black woman was significantly

different from every other mean, except for the mean of rejecting the attractive white

woman using *Rude* behaviors.

There were also a few two-way interactions involving race. Race interacted with

attractiveness to affect the use of *Avoid* rejection behaviors (see Table 3). The interaction

was significant, and post hoc contrasts showed that the use of *Avoid* behaviors to reject

attractive black individuals was significantly less than the use of these behaviors to reject

other groups. Race also interacted with gender in affecting feelings of *Empathy* and the

usage of *Not Now* rejection strategies (see Table 4). The interaction was significant, and

post hoc contrasts indicated that the mean for feeling *Empathy* for white men was

significantly less than the mean for feeling *Empathy* for white women, though neither

was significantly different from the other means. There was also a significant interaction

Table 2. The Three-way Interaction of Attractiveness, Race, and Gender on Rude Factor

| | Attractive | | | | Unattractive | | | | |
| | Black | | White | | Black | | White | | |
Factor	Men (n= 9)	Women (n= 21)	Men (n= 12)	Women (n= 25)	Men (n= 9)	Women (n= 25)	Men (n= 12)	Women (n= 27)	F
Rude	6.56_a 1.95	6.71_a 1.28	10.25_{ab} 1.69	6.80_a 1.17	12.89_b 1.95	7.16_a 1.17	7.08_a 1.69	8.67_a 1.13	6.30*

Note: *$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, ***$p < 0.001$; The top row of numbers represents the means while the numbers below represent the standard deviations; Means that don't share subscripts differ at $p < 0.05$ in the Tukey honestly significant difference comparison

with the *Not Now* strategies, and the mean for using *Not Now* strategies to reject black

women was significantly different from all the other means.

Table 3. Interaction of Race and Attractiveness on Avoid Factors

Factor	Attractive		Unattractive		F
	Black (n = 30)	White (n = 37)	Black (n = 34)	White (n = 38)	
Empathy	27.02 1.99	29.64 1.78	23.38 1.95	21.78 1.73	1.27
Annoyance	9.73 1.70	12.23 1.50	14.31 1.65	14.22 1.64	0.63
Personal Distress	18.29 2.21	20.42 1.95	20.85 2.16	20.68 2.00	0.30
Flattered	22.04 0.84	21.66 0.73	16.40 0.81	17.93 0.73	1.51
Rude	6.64 1.17	8.53 1.03	10.02 1.14	7.88 1.01	3.45
Too Different	12.94 1.86	17.55 1.66	17.88 1.89	16.39 1.63	2.98
Not Now	16.68 1.92	18.74 1.70	19.48 1.87	18.84 1.68	0.57
Tease	15.67 1.43	15.64 1.25	12.99 1.38	10.45 1.24	0.89
Avoid	8.91$_a$ 1.17	12.44$_b$ 1.02	13.99$_b$ 1.13	12.46$_b$ 1.02	5.46*

Note: *$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, ***$p < 0.001$; Means represented on the top row of numbers for each factor, bottom rows of numbers represent standard deviation; Means that don't share subscripts differ at $p < 0.05$ in the Tukey honestly significant difference comparison

Table 4. Interaction of Race and Gender on Empathy and Not Now Factors

Factor	Black		White		F
	Men (n = 18)	Women (n = 46)	Men (n = 24)	Women (n = 52)	
Empathy	23.83_{ab} 2.36	26.57_{ab} 1.49	28.58_a 2.04	22.84_b 1.42	5.14*
Annoyance	11.44 2.01	12.59 1.25	12.90 1.88	13.55 1.19	0.02
Personal Distress	17.72 2.62	21.42 1.65	20.06 2.32	21.04 1.56	0.42
Flattered	18.28 0.99	20.16 0.62	19.63 0.85	19.96 0.57	1.00
Rude	9.72 1.38	6.94 0.87	8.67 1.19	7.73 0.81	0.73
Too Different	13.49 2.27	17.32 1.37	17.79 1.91	16.15 1.34	2.40
Not Now	14.39_a 2.28	21.77_b 1.42	20.08_{bc} 1.97	17.51_{ac} 1.34	7.71**
Tease	13.89 1.68	14.78 1.06	13.96 1.45	12.13 0.99	1.05
Avoid	8.89 1.38	14.01 0.86	10.88 1.19	14.03 0.80	0.82

Note: *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001; Means represented on the top row of numbers for each factor, bottom rows of numbers represent standard deviation; Means that don't share subscripts differ at p < 0.05 in the Tukey honestly significant difference comparison

Attractiveness

The results of our tests supported the hypothesis that the attractiveness of the would-be lovers would have a significant effect on the emotions and behaviors of the rejectors. From the singular effects shown in our univariate analyses of variance, it was determined that the attractiveness of the would-be lovers had a main effect on five of the

emotional and behavioral factors (see Table 5). As anticipated, participants were more likely to feel positive emotions with attractive would-be lovers, such as *Empathy* for attractive would-be lovers, as well as *Flattered* by requests from attractive would-be lovers. They were more likely to feel negative emotions like *Annoyance* when approached by unattractive would-be lovers, as predicted.

Table 5. Effect of Attractiveness on Emotional and Behavioral Factors

Factor	Attractive (n = 67)		Unattractive (n = 73)		F
	M	SD	M	SD	
Empathy	28.33	1.34	22.58	1.30	9.49*
Annoyance	10.98	1.13	14.27	1.17	4.08*
Personal Distress	19.35	1.48	20.76	1.47	0.46
Flattered	21.85	0.56	17.16	0.54	36.37***
Rude	7.58	0.78	8.95	0.76	1.59
Too Different	15.24	1.25	17.14	1.25	1.15
Not Now	17.71	1.28	19.16	1.25	0.66
Tease	15.65	0.95	11.72	0.93	8.79**
Avoid	10.67	0.78	13.23	0.76	5.53*

Note: $*p < 0.05$, $**p < 0.01$, $***p < 0.001$; M = Mean. SD = Standard Deviation.

Our hypothesis that participants would use strategies that reflected a desire to not alienate the potential for a future relationship with attractive would-be lovers was also strengthened by the evidence that participants were more likely to utilize *Tease* strategies

if they had an attractive would-be lover. Further, our belief that participants would be more likely to evade unattractive would-be lovers was supported by the evidence that *Avoid* strategies were used in a higher frequency for unattractive would-be lovers.

Gender

Looking at the singular effects of our independent variables, gender had a main effect on the *Avoid* factor, $F(1, 141) = 14.52$, $p < 0.001$. Women ($M = 14.02$; $SD = 0.59$) were more likely to utilize behaviors that avoided direct rejection than men were ($M = 9.88$; $SD = 0.91$).

Self-Determination Factors

Several personality scales were included in our survey, but the Basic Need Satisfaction in General scale was the only one to indicate significant correlations with our emotional and behavioral factors. None of the other personality factors analyzed yielded any noteworthy correlations. We conducted a correlations test measuring the Pearson product-moment correlations between the Basic Need Satisfaction subscale factors and our emotional and behavioral factors (see Table 6). Autonomy, indicating a person's perception that they have a sense of control in their life, was significantly positively correlated with the emotional reaction *Flattered*, but significantly negatively correlated with the emotional reactions *Annoyance* and *Personal Distress*, as well as the behavioral strategy *Rude*. Competence, reflecting a person's internal belief that they are capable, was significantly positively correlated with the *Too Different* rejection factor. Relatedness, signifying a person's feeling that they have secure and stable relationships, was significantly positively correlated with the emotional factor *Flattered*, but was

22

significantly negatively correlated with the emotional factor *Personal Distress* and the

behavioral factor *Rude*.

Table 6. Correlations Between Emotional and Behavioral Factors and Basic Need
Satisfaction in General Subscales

	Autonomy	Competence	Relatedness
Empathy	-.07	-.03	-.01
Annoyance	-.19*	-.02	-.16
Personal Distress	-.26**	-.14	-.22*
Flattered	.21*	.02	.20*
Rude	-.21*	.03	-.26**
Too Different	.12	.18*	-.06
Not Now	-.08	-.01	-.03
Tease	-.15	-.10	-.05
Avoid	-.15	-.07	-.02

Note: *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

CHAPTER FOUR

Discussion and Conclusion

The present study investigated whether physical attractiveness significantly influenced the behavioral rejection strategies of rejectors in unrequited love experiences. We hypothesized that rejectors would use less harsh strategies with attractive would-be lovers and more severe strategies with unattractive would-be lovers. We also explored whether gender or race were significant variables, and based on social evolutionary theory, predicted that men were more likely to accept an attractive would-be lover and reject an unattractive would-be lover. Finally, we explored the utility of self-determination theory as a theoretical framework to further understand unrequited love from the stand point of the rejector.

Baumeister et al. (1993) described the difficulties rejectors face in unrequited love due to the scriptlessness of their situations. Our findings of internally consistent behavioral factors (*Rude*, *Too Different*, *Not Now*, *Tease*, and *Avoid*) can possibly be utilized in aiding future research aimed at providing rejectors a script for behaviors that are more or less likely under different situations. The creation of such a script could help rejectors more easily navigate a difficult situation. As such, future research may be able to address how effective these strategies may be in communicating social rejection.

One of our hypotheses was that men would be more likely to accept an attractive would-be lover, even if they didn't want to have a romantic relationship, based on the research of Rowatt & Cunningham (1999) as well as evolutionary theory. However, we unexpectedly found that women were significantly more likely to accept an attractive

would-be lover, rather than men. Nonetheless, it should be noted that the means were fairly low and thus difficult to analyze with certainty. In order to understand why this effect occurred in contrast to what was previously found, more research would need to be done, analyzing this effect specifically. Furthermore, because this pattern was contradictory to evolutionary theory, it is possible that it could be related to another theory, such as Self Determination Theory, and this should also be considered as an alternative theory in the future.

We did not have any specific hypotheses regarding which behavioral and emotional factors would be more frequently reported in general, however we did find that behaviors in the *Avoid* factor were most used to reject and emotions in the *Flattered* factor were the ones most people felt. Considering that unrequited love is a difficult situation, especially for the rejector, it is not surprising that more participants would rather indirectly reject someone, as a means of assuaging their guilt and evading having to see the pain they've caused. Avoidance may also reflect Baumeister's theory of rejector scriptlessness; because they don't know what to say to the would-be lover, they avoid them. Furthermore, although rejectors are put in a precarious situation, they are still being told that they are valued and attractive to another individual, so this effect is most likely attributed to the boost of self-esteem rejectors have, despite their other negative feelings.

We predicted that attractiveness would significantly impact rejection behaviors utilized in unrequited love, and particularly that attractive would-be lovers would be treated more positively than unattractive would-be lovers. For the most part this hypothesis was supported by our results for the *Tease*, *Empathy*, *Flattered*, *Annoyance*,

and *Avoid* factors. Attractive would-be lovers did elicit more positive reactions, and the fact that *Tease* behaviors were utilized more often could be ascribed to the fact that more people pay attention to and desire to be closer to attractive individuals (Langlois, Kalakanis, Rubenstein, Larson, Hallam & Smoot, 2000). Empathetic emotions were also reported more following interactions with attractive individuals, which may be a reflection of the perception that attractive individuals possess good and desirable personalities, thus deserving empathy (Dion, Berscheid, & Walster, 1972). Similarly the *Flattered* emotions were highly reported from rejectors with attractive would-be lovers; one probable reason for this was that rejectors were pleased that attractive individuals perceived them as attractive. The second half of our hypothesis was further strengthened by our findings that unattractive would-be lovers did prompt more negative reactions. This was evidenced by the high scores of *Annoyance* emotions reported when rejecting an unattractive would-be lover; a possible explanation for this reaction could be a stereotypic bias against unattractive faces. Griffin & Langlois (2006) hypothesized that unattractive faces elicit physiological and neurological comparable to reactions after seeing facial expressions of fear or anger; if this is true, the rejector's heightened arousal could cause them to feel frustrated or annoyed. Further negative reactions included the significant use of *Avoid* strategies used by rejectors with unattractive would-be lovers. This could be attributed to the theory of Rosen et al. (1973) that people are less willing to transmit bad news to unattractive individuals because they fear a more aggressive response.

Our analyses also explored the interactions between attractiveness, gender, and race, and our results indicated that the connections significantly impacted some of the

behavioral and emotional responses given. Our findings indicated that the participants utilized significantly more *Avoid* behaviors when rejecting unattractive black would-be lovers. Considering that our participant sample was 66.2% Caucasian and only 8.5% African-American, this could pertain to the exchange theory of interracial relationships. This theory proposes that since historically the white population has dominated social power, when interracial relationships do occur it is because the minority individual has an "exchange variable" that compensates for their less dominant social standing (Merton, 1941). In this case, physical attractiveness would be the exchange variable; however, because we did have some diversity in our sample, this theory should be analyzed with caution when applying it to our results (Murstein, Merighi, & Malloy, 1989). When rejecting white men, women were less likely to feel any *Empathy* emotions compared to when they were rejecting black men, a response that is possibly related to the fact that white men have historically had greater social status and power. Knowing this, women might feel less sympathetic for rejecting someone who is still perceived as likely having more opportunities and advantages. Women also engaged in less *Rude* behaviors than men did, but reported significant use of *Avoid* behaviors. These responses could be explained by a fear of harassment or assault. According to Baumeister & Wotman (1994), would-be lovers experience a significant amount of anger when rejected, and women are most fearful of frightening situations with angry or violent men (Brody, Lovas, & Hay, 1995). The greatest fear for most women is of being sexually assaulted, thus it would make sense then that women would tend to avoid situations of directly interacting with a potentially aggressive man (Ferraro, 1996). On the other hand, men exhibited a pattern of negative responses that were most specifically directed towards black women, and

27

especially unattractive black women. Men were least likely to use *Not Now* behaviors when rejecting black women, and since *Not Now* behaviors can imply the relationship might be possible in the future, this result indicates that they were less willing to have a future relationship. A potential cause for this reaction might be the fact that black women fall under two categories of people historically discriminated against: black people and women. While this explanation is potentially plausible, more research would need to be done to perhaps identify whether black women are treated more harshly in other situations outside of unrequited love. Further, our three-way effect indicated that men were also significantly inclined to use *Rude* behaviors when rejecting unattractive black women. We have already theorized that this could be related to historical social status discrimination, but it could also be related to the research indicating that without an exchange variable (i.e., attractiveness), individuals of minority status are considered less for interracial relationships. It could also be a possible interaction between social status and the theory that unattractive individuals elicit more heightened arousal responses and bias (Griffin & Langlois, 2006).

This study also explored the relation of Self-Determination theory to factors of rejection, and there were several significant correlations between the *Autonomy*, *Competence*, and *Relatedness* factors to the reports of behavioral and emotional responses. However, the main focus of this was to explore how the *Relatedness* factor was connected, and we found that it was positively correlated with *Flattered* emotions, but negatively correlated with *Personal Distress* emotions and the use of *Rude* rejection strategies. In Self-Determination theory, relatedness refers to the aspiration of feeling belongingness as well as forming intimate attachments with others (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

According to Reis & Patrick, relatedness involves intimacy where an individual feels validated and appreciated in their relationships (as cited in Knee, Hadden, Porter, & Rodriguez, 2013). Because of this, individuals who have high feelings of relatedness may have a smaller need for but greater appreciation of feeling valued by another person. With regards to *Personal Distress*, more research would need to be done to elucidate why someone with high relatedness scores would be less distressed about potentially hurting someone desiring a relationship with them. However, one possible explanation could be that because high relatedness scores indicate a sense of security and closeness in an individual's relationships, these individuals would experience less *Personal Distress* emotions because they do not feel as distressed by rejecting an opportunity to develop another relationship. The negative correlation between *Rude* behaviors and *Relatedness* would also need to be further explored, but perhaps since individuals with higher senses of relatedness may understand the importance of developing intimate relationships, they would have more compassion on those who are seeking such relationships, and thus treat them more kindly. This research has helped to further identify factors that *Relatedness* could potentially be linked to, but more research should be done to will give us a more concrete understanding. Further, since negotiating unrequited love was evidenced to be related to Autonomy and Competence, these factors should be considered in future research as well.

Our study did have limitations in the methodology and demographic results. Because we utilized a hypothetical scenario, it could have affected the participant's reactions to the situation since they were not personally invested in the interaction, unlike Baumeister et al.'s (1993) use of autobiographical narratives. Both methodologies have

strong and weak elements, so both should be used in further research of unrequited love. Furthermore, we faced limitation in that our sample wasn't very large, making it difficult to determine whether our results are applicable to the population as a whole. In the same vein, we did not have the ethnic diversity of participants that we hoped for in order to fully address the race component of our research. Because of these limitations, more research should be utilizing a variety of methodologies, as well as greater and more diverse sampling.

To conclude, this study has added more to our understanding of unrequited love by helping us to identify factors that affect rejection interactions, and showing that attractiveness does indeed have an impact on our rejection behaviors. Thus, we have made steps towards developing a better understanding of rejector's experiences and perhaps provided more information needed to create scripts for rejectors that will help in handling these challenging situations. Further research should look more at the impact of race factors, as well as whether relationship status affects rejection behaviors, but this study has effectively developed a basis for such research to build off of.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

Navigating Social Rejection Survey

1. What is your age? _____

2. What is your gender?   Male   Female

3. What is your major field of study? _____

4. What is your academic classification?

   Freshman

   Sophomore

   Junior

   Senior

   Fifth Year

   Graduate

5. What is your race/ethnicity?

   African-American

   Asian-American

   Caucasian/Non-Hispanic

   Hispanic/Latino

   Other

6. What is your current relationship status?
   Single

   In a casual relationship

   In a serious relationship

Engaged

Married

M/A/W (Men / Attractive / White) Condition

Instructions: This survey is designed to measure people's responses to certain social situations. Please read the following scenario very carefully and imagine that the situation described has happened to you. Additionally, please read all the questions carefully and answer honestly. There are no right or wrong responses, only your honest opinion.

Scenario: While out with friends one night, you see Jessica, a girl who is currently in one of your classes. Although her face is familiar, you can only recall talking to her once or twice at most, and you have never expressed any feelings of attraction to or desire for her. Later on that night, Jessica pulls you aside and tells you, "I've seen you in class before and can't help but notice you. Would you like to go on a date with me?" You think Jessica is a nice girl, but you are simply not interested in being romantically involved with her.

Instructions: Please answer all questions as if the situation in the scenario happened to you. Circle the number that corresponds best to your answer. Please try to imagine as vividly as possible the situation described in the scenario above has happened to you.

1. Based on the picture, how physically attractive is the person?

Not at all attractive				Not sure			Extremely attractive	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

2. Based on the scenario, how clear is it to you that this person is interested in a romantic relationship with you?

Not at all clear				Not sure			Very clear	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

3. Based on the scenario, how likely do you think it is that you will see this person again in the future?

Not at all likely				Not sure			Very likely	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Instructions: Please indicate the likelihood that you would experience the following emotions in your immediate response to being in the situation described in the scenario.

	Not at all			Not sure				Extremely	
4. Admired	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5. Alarmed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6. Angry	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
7. Annoyed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
8. Ashamed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
9. Attractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

10. Betrayed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
11. Close	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
12. Compassionate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
13. Complimented	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
14. Concerned	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15. Confused	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
16. Desirable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
17. Disgusted	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
18. Disinterested	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
19. Distressed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
20. Disturbed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
21. Embarrassed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
22. Empathy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
23. Flattered	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
24. Grieved	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
25. Guilty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
26. Happy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
27. Impatient	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
28. Irritated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
29. Moved	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
30. Offended	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31. Perturbed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
32. Sexually aroused	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

33. Softhearted	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
34. Surprised	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
35. Sympathetic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
36. Tender	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
37. Troubled	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
38. Upset	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
39. Warm	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
40. Worried	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

41. How likely would you be to reject or accept this person's offer?

Extremely likely likely to *reject*				Not Sure				Extremely to *accept*
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

42. How well does the following statement describe you? "I think I would have a great deal of difficulty communicating my lack of interest and would probably end up going out with person BECAUSE I could not say no."

This statement *DOES NOT* describe me				Not Sure			This statement *DOES* describe me	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

43. If forced to make a decision to accept or reject the offer, which would you choose?

_____ Reject the offer

_____ Accept the offer

44. In this situation, how concerned would you be about hurting this person's feelings?

Not at all concerned				Not Sure			Extremely concerned	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

45. How much would you want this person as a friend?

Not at all				Not Sure				Very much so
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

46. How free would you feel to express your true feelings?

Not at all free				Not Sure				Very free
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

47. How uncomfortable would you feel communicating your lack of interest in this

person?

Extremely uncomfortable				Not Sure				Extremely comfortable
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

48. How uncomfortable would you be if you had to see this person again?

Extremely uncomfortable				Not Sure				Extremely comfortable
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

49. How likely would you be to <u>lie</u> to protect the person's feelings in this situation?

Not at all likely to lie				Not Sure				Extremely likely to lie
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

50. How important do you feel it is to tell this person the truth in this situation, even if the

truth is likely to hurt the person's feelings?

Truth not at all important				Not Sure				Truth extremely important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

51. How hurt do you think your would-be lover would feel if rejected by you?

Not at all   Not   Extremely

hurt   Sure   hurt

      1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

Instructions: Assume you were going to REJECT this person's offer. How likely is it that you would engage in the following behaviors in your immediate response to the situation described in the scenario? Please circle your response on the scale provided.

Not at all   Not   Extremely

likely   sure   likely

      1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

1. Avoid the person

      1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

2. Have your friend tell the person you aren't interested

      1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

3. Say nothing to the person

      1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

4. Tell the person they are unattractive

      1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

5. Tell the person you are not attracted to them

      1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

6. Tell the person you aren't attracted to their personality

      1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

7. Say you don't think it is appropriate for them to ask you out

      1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

8. Tell the person their actions make you uncomfortable

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

9. Tell the person they have poor grooming

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

10. Tell the person they hang around with the wrong crowd

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

11. Tell the person you just want to be friends

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

12. Say you are already in a relationship or are interested in a relationship with someone

   else

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

13. Say the timing isn't right

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

14. Say you like playing the field and don't want to settle down with one person

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

15. Say you just got out of a relationship or just got divorced

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

16. Say that you hate women (or men)

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

17. Say that your family or friends would not approve of the relationship

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

18. Say that you wouldn't want a long distance relationship

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

19. Say that you have no time for a relationship

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

20. Say that the relationship just wouldn't work

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

21. Say you don't feel the same way about them

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

22. Say that you both want different things

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

23. Say that you are incompatible with each other

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

24. Lie and make up an excuse not to go

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

25. Accept the date, but don't show up

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

26. Keep conversation short by being blunt, rude, or sarcastic

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

27. Give them a look of annoyance

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

28. Give them your phone number

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

29. Give them a fake phone number

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

30. Flirt with them

           1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

31. Give them a compliment

           1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

32. Tell them you feel uncomfortable dating someone of their ethnicity

           1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

33. Say you just don't know them well enough

           1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

34. Say no, but hide the real reason so as not to hurt their feelings

           1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

35. Would not reject, would rather accept the offer even though I was not interested in a romantic relationship

           1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

From this list of 35 behaviors above, please choose the one behavior that you would be the most likely to do in response to the situation described in the scenario. Place the number that corresponds to that behavior below.

      Behavior most likely to do: #_____

Referring to the behavior you just indicated, how effective do you think that behavior would be in communicating to this person that you do not want any romantic involvement with them?

            Not at all effective   Not sure   Very effective
                 1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

Basic Psychological Needs Scales (Basic Need Satisfaction in General)

Instructions: Please read each of the following items carefully, thinking about how it relates to your life, and then indicate how true it is for you. Use the following scale to respond:

Not at all true		Somewhat true		Very true	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1. I feel like I am free to decide for myself how to live my life.

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7

2. I really like the people I interact with.

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7

3. Often, I do not feel very competent.

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7

4. I feel pressured in my life.

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7

5. People I know tell me I am good at what I do.

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7

6. I get along with people I come into contact with.

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7

7. I pretty much keep to myself and don't have a lot of social contacts.

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7

8. I generally feel free to express my ideas and opinions.

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7

9. I consider the people I regularly interact with to be my friends.

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5   6   7</div>

10. I have been able to learn interesting new skills recently.

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5   6   7</div>

11. In my daily life, I frequently have to do what I am told.

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5   6   7</div>

12. People in my life care about me.

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5   6   7</div>

13. Most days I feel a sense of accomplishment from what I do.

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5   6   7</div>

14. People I interact with on a daily basis tend to take my feelings into consideration.

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5   6   7</div>

15. In my life I do not get much of a chance to show how capable I am.

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5   6   7</div>

16. There are not many people that I am close to.

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5   6   7</div>

17. I feel like I can pretty much be myself in daily situations.

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5   6   7</div>

18. The people I interact with regularly do not seem to like me much.

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5   6   7</div>

19. I often do not feel very capable.

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5   6   7</div>

20. There is not much opportunity for me to decide for myself how to do things in my daily life.

<div align="center">

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

</div>

21. People are generally pretty friendly towards me.

<div align="center">

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

</div>

The Authenticity Inventory

The following measure has a series of statements that involve people's perceptions about themselves. There are not right or wrong responses, so please answer honestly. Respond to each statement by writing the number from the scale below, which you feel most accurately characterizes your response to the statement.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

1. ____ I am often confused about my feelings.

2. ____ I frequently pretend to enjoy something when in actuality I really don't.

3. ____ For better or for worse I am aware of who I truly am.

4. ____ I understand why I believe the things I do about myself.

5. ____ I want people with whom I am close to understand my strengths.

6. ____ I actively try to understand which of my self-aspects fit together to form my core- or true-self.

7. ____ I am very uncomfortable objectively considering my limitations and shortcomings.

8. ____ I've often used my silence or head-nodding to convey agreement with someone else's statement or position even though I really disagree.

9. ____ I have a very good understanding of why I do the things I do.

<div align="center">44</div>

10. _____ I am willing to change myself for others if the reward is desirable
enough.

11. _____ I find it easy to pretend to be something other than my true-self.

12. _____ I want people with whom I am close to understand my weaknesses.

13. _____ I find it very difficult to critically assess myself.

14. _____ I am not in touch with my deepest thoughts and feelings.

15. _____ I make it a point to express to close others how much I truly care   for them

16. _____ I tend to have difficulty accepting my personal faults, so I try to cast them in a
more positive way

17. _____ I tend to idealize close others rather than objectively see them as they truly are.

18. _____ If asked, people I am close to can accurately describe what kind of
person I am.

19. _____ I prefer to ignore my darkest thoughts and feelings.

20. _____ I am aware of when I am not being my true-self.

21. _____ I am able to distinguish those self-aspects that are important to my
core-or true-self from those that are unimportant.

22. _____ People close to me would be shocked or surprised if they discovered what I
keep inside me.

23. _____ It is important for me to understand my close others' needs and
desires.

24. _____ I want close others to understand the real me rather than just my
public persona or ''image.''

25. _____ I try to act in a manner that is consistent with my personally held
values, even if others criticize or reject me for doing so.

26. _____ If a close other and I are in disagreement I would rather ignore the
issue than constructively work it out.

27. _____ I've often done things that I don't want to do merely not to disappoint people.

28. _____ I find that my behavior typically expresses my values.

29. _____ I actively attempt to understand myself as best as possible.

30. _____ I'd rather feel good about myself than objectively assess my personal limitations and shortcomings.

31. _____ I find that my behavior typically expresses my personal needs and desires.

32. _____ I rarely if ever, put on a ''false face'' for others to see.

33. _____ I spend a lot of energy pursuing goals that are very important to other people even though they are unimportant to me.

34. _____ I frequently am not in touch with what's important to me.

35. _____ I try to block out any unpleasant feelings I might have about myself.

36. _____ I often question whether I really know what I want to accomplish in my lifetime.

37. _____ I often find that I am overly critical about myself.

38. _____ I am in touch with my motives and desires.

39. _____ I often deny the validity of any compliments that I receive.

40. _____ In general, I place a good deal of importance on people I am close to understanding who I truly am.

41. _____ I find it difficult to embrace and feel good about the things I have accomplished.

42. _____ If someone points out or focuses on one of my shortcomings I quickly try to block it out of my mind and forget it.

43. _____ The people I am close to can count on me being who I am regardless of what setting we are in.

44. _____ My openness and honesty in close relationships are extremely important to me.

45. _____ I am willing to endure negative consequences by expressing my true beliefs about things.

Relationship Belief Inventory

The statements below describe ways in which a person might feel about a relationship with another person. Please mark the space next to each statement according to how strongly you believe that it is true or false for you. *Please mark every one.* Write in 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, or 0 to stand for the following answers.

> 5: I strongly believe that the statement is *true*
>
> 4: I believe that the statement is *true*
>
> 3: I believe that the statement is *probably true*, or more true than false
>
> 2: I believe that the statement is *probably false*, or more false than true
>
> 1: I believe that the statement is *false*
>
> 0: I strongly believe that the statement is *false*

1. _____ If your partner expresses disagreement with your ideas, s/he probably does not think highly of you.

2. _____ I do not expect my partner to sense all my moods.

3. _____ Damages done early in a relationship probably cannot be reversed.

4. _____ I get upset if I think I have not completely satisfied my partner sexually.

5. _____ Men and women have the same basic emotion needs.

6. _____ I cannot accept it when my partner disagrees with me.

7. _____ If I have to tell my partner that something is important to me, it does not mean s/he is insensitive to me.

8. _____ My partner does not seem capable of behaving other than s/he does now.

9. _____ If I'm not in the mood for sex when my partner is, I don't get upset about it.

10. _____ Misunderstandings between partners generally are due to inborn differences in psychological makeups of men and women.

11. _____ I take it as a personal insult when my partner disagrees with an important idea of mine.

12. _____ I get very upset if my partner if my partner does not recognize how I am feeling and I have to tell him/her.

13. _____ A partner can learn to become more responsive to his/her partner's needs.

14. _____ A good sexual partner can get himself/herself aroused for sex whenever necessary.

15. _____ Men and women probably will never understand the opposite sex very well.

16. _____ I like it when my partner presents views different from mine.

17. _____ People who have a close relationship can sense each other's needs as if they could read each other's minds.

18. _____ Just because my partner has acted in ways that upset me does not mean that s/he will do so in the future.

19. _____ If I cannot perform well sexually whenever my partner is in the mood, I would consider that I have a problem.

20. _____ Men and women need the same basic things out of a relationship.

21. _____ I get very upset when my partner and I cannot see things the same way.

22. _____ It is important to me for my partner to anticipate my needs by sensing changes in my moods.

23. _____ A partner who hurts you badly once probably will hurt you again.

24. _____ I can feel OK about my lovemaking even if my partner does not achieve orgasm.

25. _____ Biological differences between men and women are not major causes of couples' problems.

26. _____ I cannot tolerate it when my partner argues with me.

27. _____ A partner should know what you are thinking or feeling without you having to tell.

28. _____ If my partner wants to change, I believe that s/he can do it.

29. ____ If my sexual partner does not get satisfied completely, it does not mean that I have failed.

30. ____ One of the major causes of marital problems is that men and women have different emotional needs.

31. ____ When my partner and I disagree, I feel like our relationship is falling apart.

32. ____ People who love each other know exactly what each other's thoughts are without a word ever being said.

33. ____ If you don't like the way a relationship is going, you can make it better.

34. ____ Some difficulties in my sexual performance do not mean personal failure to me.

35. ____ You can't really understand someone of the opposite sex.

36. ____ I do not doubt my partner's feelings for me when we argue.

37. ____ If you have to ask your partner for something, it shows that s/he was not "tuned into" your needs.

38. ____ I do not expect my partner to be able to change.

39. ____ When I do not seem to be performing well sexually, I get upset.

40. ____ Men and women will always be mysteries to each other.

Sex attitudes survey (Socialsexuality Orientation Inventory)

Instructions: Please answer the following questions honestly. For the questions dealing with behavior, write your answers in the blank spaces provided. For the questions dealing with thoughts and attitudes, circle the appropriate number on the scales provided.

1. With how many different partners have you had sex (sexual intercourse) in the past year? _____

2. How many different partners do you foresee yourself having sex with during the next five years? (Please give a specific, realistic estimate). _____

3. With how many different partners have you had sex on one and only one occasion?

_____

4. How often do you fantasize about having sex with someone other than your current dating partner? (Circle one answer).

1 = never

2 = once every two or three months

3 = once a month

4 = once every two weeks

5 = once a week

6 = a few times each week

7 = nearly every day

8 = at least once a day

5. Sex without love is OK. (circle your response)

I strongly disagree   I strongly agree

         1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

6. I can imagine myself being comfortable and enjoying "casual" sex with different partners.

I strongly disagree   I strongly agree

         1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

7. I would have to be closely attached to someone (both emotionally and psychologically) before I could feel comfortable and fully enjoy having sex with him or her.

I strongly disagree   I strongly agree

         1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

M/A/B (Men / Attractive / Black) Condition

Scenario: While out with friends one night, you see Jessica, a girl who is currently in one of your classes. Although her face is familiar, you can only recall talking to her once or twice at most, and you have never expressed any feelings of attraction to or desire for her. Later on that night, Jessica pulls you aside and tells you, "I've seen you in class before and can't help but notice you. Would you like to go on a date with me?" You think Jessica is a nice girl, but you are simply not interested in being romantically involved with her.

Scenario: While out with friends one night, you see Jessica, a girl who is currently in one of your classes. Although her face is familiar, you can only recall talking to her once or twice at most, and you have never expressed any feelings of attraction to or desire for her. Later on that night, Jessica pulls you aside and tells you, "I've seen you in class before and can't help but notice you. Would you like to go on a date with me?" You think Jessica is a nice girl, but you are simply not interested in being romantically involved with her.

Scenario: While out with friends one night, you see Jessica, a girl who is currently in one of your classes. Although her face is familiar, you can only recall talking to her once or twice at most, and you have never expressed any feelings of attraction to or desire for her. Later on that night, Jessica pulls you aside and tells you, "I've seen you in class before and can't help but notice you. Would you like to go on a date with me?" You think Jessica is a nice girl, but you are simply not interested in being romantically involved with her.

Scenario: While out with friends one night, you see Michael, a guy who is currently in one of your classes. Although his face is familiar, you can only recall talking to him once or twice at most, and you have never expressed any feelings of attraction to or desire for him. Later on that night, Michael pulls you aside and tells you, "I've seen you in class before and can't help but notice you. Would you like to go on a date with me?" You think Michael is a nice guy, but you are simply not interested in being romantically involved with him.

Scenario: While out with friends one night, you see Michael, a guy who is currently in one of your classes. Although his face is familiar, you can only recall talking to him once or twice at most, and you have never expressed any feelings of attraction to or desire for him. Later on that night, Michael pulls you aside and tells you, "I've seen you in class before and can't help but notice you. Would you like to go on a date with me?" You think Michael is a nice guy, but you are simply not interested in being romantically involved with him.

Scenario: While out with friends one night, you see Michael, a guy who is currently in one of your classes. Although his face is familiar, you can only recall talking to him once or twice at most, and you have never expressed any feelings of attraction to or desire for him. Later on that night, Michael pulls you aside and tells you, "I've seen you in class before and can't help but notice you. Would you like to go on a date with me?" You think Michael is a nice guy, but you are simply not interested in being romantically involved with him.

Scenario: While out with friends one night, you see Michael, a guy who is currently in one of your classes. Although his face is familiar, you can only recall talking to him once or twice at most, and you have never expressed any feelings of attraction to or desire for him. Later on that night, Michael pulls you aside and tells you, "I've seen you in class before and can't help but notice you. Would you like to go on a date with me?" You think Michael is a nice guy, but you are simply not interested in being romantically involved with him.

REFERENCES

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *117*(3), 497–529. http://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497

Baumeister, R. F., & Wotman, S. R. (1994). *Breaking Hearts: The Two Sides of Unrequited Love*. Guilford Publications. Retrieved from https://books.google.com/books?id=zlq_KXwCJ6gC

Baumeister, R. F., Wotman, S. R., & Stillwell, A. M. (1993). Unrequited love: On heartbreak, anger, guilt, scriptlessness, and humiliation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *64*(3), 377.

Brody, L. R., Lovas, G. S., & Hay, D. H. (1995). Gender differences in anger and fear as a function of situational context. *Sex Roles*, *32*(1-2), 47–78. http://doi.org/10.1007/BF01544757

Clark, R., & Hatfield, E. (1989). Gender differences in receptivity to sexual offers. *Journal of Psychology & Human Sexuality*, *2*(1), 39–55. http://doi.org/10.1300/J056v02n01_04

Dion, K., Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. (1972). What is beautiful is good. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *24*(3), 285–290. http://doi.org/10.1037/h0033731

Eidelson, R. J., & Epstein, N. (1982). Cognition and relationship maladjustment: Development of a measure of dysfunctional relationship beliefs. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *50*(5), 715–720. http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.50.5.715

Erikson, E. H. (1993). *Childhood and society*. WW Norton & Company.

Ferraro, K. F. (1996). Women's fear of victimization: Shadow of sexual assault? *Social Forces*, *75*(2), 667–690. http://doi.org/10.2307/2580418

Field, C. J., Kimuna, S. R., & Straus, M. A. (2013). Attitudes toward interracial relationships among college students: Race, class, gender, and perceptions of parental views. *Journal of Black Studies*, *44*(7), 741–776. http://doi.org/10.1177/0021934713507580

Folkes, V. S. (1982). Communicating the reasons for social rejection. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *18*(3), 235–252. http://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(82)90052-X

Griffin, A. M., & Langlois, J. H. (2006). Stereotype directionality and attractiveness stereotyping: Is beauty good or is ugly bad? *Social Cognition*, *24*(2), 187–206. http://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2006.24.2.187

James, A. D., & Tucker, M. B. (2003). Racial ambiguity and relationship formation in the United States: Theoretical and practical considerations. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *20*(2), 153–169. http://doi.org/10.1177/02654075030202002

Johnston, M. M., & Finney, S. J. (2010). Measuring basic needs satisfaction: Evaluating previous research and conducting new psychometric evaluations of the Basic Needs Satisfaction in General Scale. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *35*(4), 280–296.

Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K., & Newton, T. L. (2001). Marriage and health: His and hers. *Psychological Bulletin*, *127*(4), 472–503. http://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.4.472

Langlois, J. H., Kalakanis, L., Rubenstein, A. J., Larson, A., Hallam, M., & Smoot, M. (2000). Maxims or myths of beauty? A meta-analytic and theoretical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *126*(3), 390–423. http://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.126.3.390

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, *50*(4), 370–396. http://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346

Moore, E. R. (1968). Loving v. Virginia. *Encyclopedia of Civil Rights in America*, 548–549.

Pervin, L. A., & John, O. P. (Eds.). (1999). A social cognitive theory of personality. In *Handbook of personality: theory and research* (2nd ed, pp. 154–196). New York: Guilford Press.

Reis, H. T., & Aron, A. (2008). Love: What is it, why does it matter, and how does it operate? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *3*(1), 80–86. http://doi.org/10.2307/40212231

Rosen, S., Johnson, R. D., Johnson, M. J., & Tesser, A. (1973). Interactive effects of new valence and attraction on communicator behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *28*(3), 298–300. http://doi.org/10.1037/h0035101

Rowatt, T.J. (2011). Further exploration of the cause and consequences of unrequited love. Poster presented at the 2011 meeting of the Society for the Personality and Social Psychology, Tampa, FL.

Rowatt, T. J., & Cunningham, M. (1999). "Let's just be friends": The communication of social rejection in unrequited love. Paper presented at the 1998 meeting of the International Network on Personal Relationships, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, *55*(1), 68.

Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. W. (1991). Individual differences in sociosexuality: Evidence for convergent and discriminant validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *60*(6), 870–883. http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.60.6.870

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1994). *1990 Census of Population and Housing - Race of Couples: Table 2*. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/race/interractab2.txt

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2012). *Household and Families: 2010 Census Brief*. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-14.pdf

Walster, E., Aronson, V., Abrahams, D., & Rottman, L. (1966). Importance of physical attractiveness in dating behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *4*(5), 508–516. http://doi.org/10.1037/h0021188