The example masked manuscript below features key points to review before submitting your own research for potential publication in a peer-reviewed journal. For your convenience, citations to the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (6th Edition) are included where appropriate.

If you would like to view the final, published version of this example article, by authors Abigail A. Camden and Carrie M. Brown, please visit https://doi.org/10.24839/2325-7342.JN22.4.294. Also, to uncover 40 additional common APA Style mistakes, see the recent invited editorial, “Conquering APA Style: Advice From APA Style Experts” at https://doi.org/10.24839/2325-7342.JN22.3.154.
RESILIENCE AND PERCEIVED PARENTAL REJECTION

Perceived Parental Rejection in Middle Childhood as a Predictor of Psychological Adjustment

Negative relationships with parents can affect individuals in psychological adjustment ( Rohner & Rising, 2006; “ Ronald P. Rohner & Khaleque, 2002), and stress levels (Jurema et al., 2013). Specific rejection—addressed in interpersonal acceptance-rejection theory (1993; McClellan, 2002)—is one negative parental relationship that can impact effective stress management through the negative correlates associated with it (e.g., emotional instability, low self-esteem; Rohner & Rising, 2006; “ Ronald P. Rohner, 2004). This difficulty dealing with stress relates to resilience, the ability to bounce back from, or thrive despite, stress that is potentially traumatic (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013). Resilience is positively associated with numerous factors, including self-efficacy (Smith et al., 2008), self-esteem (Mizzuto et al., 2016), and by definition, coping well with stress (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013). Conversely, perceived parental rejection—the perception of coldness, hostility, neglect, or some other form of rejection—is correlated with negative self-efficacy, negative self-esteem, and reduced stress management (Rohner & Rising, 2006).

Despite the importance of resilience (McClellan, Muinukannova, Andrew, Burchfield, & Violanti, 2014) and the negative effects of perceived parental rejection (Rohner, 2004), only a few studies have evaluated this relationship. Sart, Birkan, Erkmen, and Serbest (2016) conducted a mediational study and found that resilience mediated the relationship between perceived rejection and depressive symptoms for female, but not male, Turkish college students. Mckinney (1996) demonstrated that psychological hardness, a construct related to resilience, negatively correlated with perceived parental rejection. Additionally, in a review article, Rohner (2005) suggested that resilience, coupled with healthy relationships, is integral to overcoming the effects of perceived parental rejection. Therefore, the paucity of studies on perceived parental rejection is a significant gap in the literature.
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perceived rejection may still be highly resilient. Coping subscale theory is the most undeveloped area of PARQ theory research, and it is still unclear why some thrive yet others struggle (Rohrer, 2016). Therefore, the present study aimed to extend coping subscale theory by evaluating resilience.

**Present Study: Perceived Parental Rejection and Resilience**

It appears that the measures of perceived parental rejection and resilience could be inversely related. Indeed, research has begun to address resilience as it relates to perceived parental rejection through using mediational models (Sart et al., 2016) or evaluating related constructs (e.g., psychological hardship; Melkert, 1996). However, more studies are warranted. For example, Sart et al. (2016) found resilience to mediate between rejection and depression only for women. Thus, research is needed to understand the gender difference that Sart et al. (2016) found and to explore the relationship between resilience and rejection in other cultures, as their study was conducted in Turkey. Moreover, our previous research with a small sample of women showed some significantly negative, yet weak, associations between perceived maternal rejection and resilience (Camden, Brown, Biñsker, Zhang, & Carter, 2016), leaving more room for exploration, particularly in the realm of gender. Therefore, in the present study, we had two aims: (a) we sought to investigate if perceived paternal and maternal rejection would predict lower resiliency, for both men and women, and (b) we were curious if perceived paternal and maternal rejection would have different predictive strengths for men and women, separately.

**Method**

**Participants**

Participants (N = 371) comprised 207 women (age range: 18–76, M = 29.01, SD = 13.42) and 101 men from the United States (age range: 18–78, M = 36.29, SD = 15.54), with a mean age of 36.29 (SD = 15.45, age range: 18–78). Inclusion criteria for participation comprised English proficiency (i.e., good–very strong on our survey) and current residence in the United States. If institutional review board approval indicated in the manuscript (this is a unique requirement for Psi Chi Journal).
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In their psychometric study, Smith et al. (2008) found alphas convergent validity, they found it to positively correlate with other measures. Thus, we used a measure of resilience and positive affect, and negatively with anxiety and depression. We found an alpha of .67 for men and .68 for women.

After we gained approval from the institutional review board, 20 research assistants used flyers, e-mail, and social media to recruit participants via snowball sampling. To increase the representation of men in the sample, we also recruited 60 additional men (19.48% of N = 308) from Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk). These men did not significantly differ from the other men in age, nor their likelihood of being Hispanic or Latino, Black, Native American or Alaskan Native, or a race/ethnicity that they classified as “other.” However, MTurk men were more likely to be White or Asian. Additionally, there could be other critical differences between our MTurk sample and non-MTurk sample that we did not measure, for example, we did not evaluate response bias in participants. Nonetheless, MTurk participants were subject to the same inclusion criteria as non-MTurk participants, including living in the United States and denoting “good” to “very strong” English language proficiency. All participants responded to the survey online using Survey Monkey, and MTurk workers were compensated $0.50. Although participation in this research was voluntary, participants could choose to participate in a drawing for one of two $50 Amazon gift cards by providing their e-mail address in a separate linked survey that was not connected to their survey data.

**Results**

Table 1 includes the intercorrelations and descriptive statistics for all main study variables, in addition to those for the subscales of the PARQ: Mother and PARQ: Father.
RESILIENCE AND PERCEIVED PARENTAL REJECTION

individual contribution to the model, perceived paternal rejection significantly predicted resilience, $\beta = -0.19, p = .007$, while maternal rejection did not, $\beta = 0.03, p = .87$. Additionally, we found that resilience positively correlated with age, $r = -22, p < .001$. Controlling for age in the multiple regression (see Table 4), the model remained significant, $F(3, 236) = 8.84, p < .001$, and $R^2$ accounted for more variance in resilience (11.1%). Again, only perceived paternal rejection made an independent contribution to the model, $\beta = -0.22, p = .002$, and perceived maternal rejection was not a significant predictor, $\beta = 0.04, p = .57$. The covariate, age, also remained significant, $\beta = -0.27, p < .001$. This model had a larger effect size than the original regression, $f^2 = 1.12$, though still small.

For our second aim, we investigated if perceived paternal and maternal rejection would differ in their predictive strength for men and women separately. To evaluate this, we conducted the same multiple regression again, but separately for men and women. In both cases, the data met the assumption of normality based on intercorrelations, tolerance, variance inflation factor, and condition indices. For men (see Table 5), the equation was significant, $F(2, 76) = 7.28, p = .001$, with $R^2$ accounting for 16.1% of variance. The model had a medium effect size, $f^2 = 0.19$. Perceived paternal rejection significantly predicted men’s resilience, $\beta = -0.29, p = .02$, but perceived maternal rejection did not, $\beta = -0.15, p = .22$. Controlling for age (see Table 6), the model remained significant, $F(3, 75) = 7.13, p < .001$, and accounted for more variance in resilience (22.5%), with a large effect size, $f^2 = 0.59$. Again, perceived paternal rejection contributed independently to the model, $\beta = -0.34, p < .001$, and perceived maternal rejection did not predict resilience, $\beta = -0.11, p = .09$. Age also remained a significant predictor in the final model, $\beta = -0.25, p = .018$. For women (see Table 7), the equation was not significant, $F(2, 160) = 1.61, p = .20$, neither perceived paternal rejection nor perceived maternal rejection predicted women’s resilience. Interestingly, controlling for age (see Table 8), the model became

|Discussion|

In the present study, we sought to explore (a) how perceived paternal and maternal rejection together predicted resilience for men and women, and (b) how the variance in paternal and maternal rejection accounted for might differ for men and women separately. For our first goal, we found that paternal and maternal rejection together significantly predicted resilience, such that, as rejection increases, the predicted resilience level decreases. However, the variance that rejection accounted for was relatively small. Moreover, within that multiple regression, when we evaluated the independent contribution of maternal rejection, we found that, while maternal rejection was not significant, the model remained a significant predictor in the final model.

Second, addressing our other aim to compare genders, we found that, for men, maternal and paternal rejection together significantly predicted resilience and accounted for a larger amount of variance than our original model with both men and women. Within that multiple regression, we found that the independent contribution of maternal and paternal rejection, only paternal rejection significantly predicted resilience. This independent contribution was also true once we controlled for age, and age remained a significant predictor in the final model. Interestingly, for women, this was not the case; we did not find women’s resilience to be predicted by perceived parental rejection.
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### Table 1

**Intercorrelations and Descriptives for Main Study Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARQ: Mother</td>
<td>38.79</td>
<td>16.04</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.93**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldness</td>
<td>13.56</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.92**</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undiff. Rej.</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARQ: Father</td>
<td>43.47</td>
<td>17.13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.91**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldness</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.92**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undiff. Rej.</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** PARQ/Mother = Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire: Mother Total Score; Coldness = Warmth/Affection subscale; Hostility = Hostility/Aggression subscale; Neglect = Indifference/Neglect subscale; Undiff. Rej. = Undifferentiated Rejection subscale; PARQ: Father = Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire: Father Total Score; Min = minimum possible score; Max = maximum possible score.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .001$. 
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