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Abstract

Gelotophobia is defined as the fear of being laughed at. Recent empirical studies revealed that it is a valid and useful new concept also in the realm of normality. Furthermore, it was shown that it should be best conceptualized as a one-dimensional individual differences phenomenon ranging from no fear to extreme fear of being laughed at. The present study presents empirical data on the fear of being laughed at in Denmark (N = 247). It describes the adaptation of the standard instrument for the subjective assessment of gelotophobia to Danish. The translation yielded good psychometric properties in terms of a high internal consistency of the items (α = .84) and the factorial structure (one-dimensional solution) was highly similar to findings with the original instrument. Gelotophobia was more prevalent among younger participants, males, and participants that were currently in a relationship. The application of cut-off scores in the questionnaire that indicate different levels of gelotophobia indicated that a low number of participants in the sample (< 2%) were gelotophobes. Therefore, fearing to be laughed at does not seem to be prevalent in the everyday life of Danes. Nevertheless, gelotophobia might be more prevalent among specific groups (e.g., victims of bullying).
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Introduction

Most people enjoy humor and laughter in their day-to-day life. Social situations involving common laughter and smiling are usually experienced as something positive, as relaxing or joyful. However, there are case-studies and empirical studies that suggest that a group of persons exists that do not experience laughter by others as positive but as harmful. It seems as though they are more likely to interpret laughter as a means to put them down. For them, a friendly smile is something irritating that causes unease. Hearing laughter makes them suspicious and they experience their fear of being laughed at as a constant distress. Their ideas about laughter are accompanied by the conviction of actually being ridiculous and that others are laughing at them for a good reason.
The German psychotherapist Michael Titze coined the term gelotophobia (gelos is Greek for laughter) for describing a group among his patients that constantly fears to be laughed at (for an overview see Titze, 2009). He also observed a pattern of awkward, wooden movements of gelotophobes when confronted with laughter that reminded him of the posture of marionettes; referring to the perhaps most famous marionette he used the term “Pinocchio-complex” to describe this pattern of movements. Of course, being laughed at in a mean-spirited way is not a pleasurable experience (evoking anger and sadness, but also disgust, shame and fear; see Platt, 2008) but for gelotophobes, almost all forms of laughter, even the positive, good-natured, and prosocial forms (laughing with others) seem to be threatening.

In the first empirical study on the fear of being laughed at, Ruch & Proyer (2008a) examined whether a group of diagnosed gelotophobes could be separated from other clinical groups, based on the scores of a list of 46 statements describing the experiential world of gelotophobes. Their results suggested that the gelotophobes had scored highest compared to groups of shame-based and non-shame based neurotics (according to Nathanson, 1992) and normal controls. Furthermore, Ruch and Proyer demonstrated that those items yielded the highest discriminant validity that focused on the core symptoms of the fear of being laughed at. Ruch and Proyer (2008b) developed a scoring key for the list of statements that allows the assessment of gelotophobia by means of an economic 15-item questionnaire. The GELOPH<15> contains the core items of gelotophobia only. The authors also suggested that different degrees of gelotophobia should be distinguished. Thus, they derived cut-off points indicating slight, pronounced, and extreme expressions of gelotophobia. The criteria used were: (1) the answer format of the questionnaire (the scale mid point is 2.50 and a person with this score have agreed to at least half of the items); (2) a score of two standard deviations above the mean in the group of normal controls; and (3) the score at which the distribution curves of normal controls and diagnosed gelotophobes intersected. Interestingly, the application of the cut-off scores showed that there was a considerable number of normal controls that showed at least a slight expression of gelotophobia (11.65% in a German sample). Therefore, Ruch and Proyer concluded that gelotophobia is of relevance within the range of normality as well and that it should be studied best as an individual difference phenomenon on a sub-clinical level that ranges on a continuum from no fear to extreme fear of being laughed at.

From then, the research program for empirically studying the fear of being laughed at was extended to a shift of focus towards non-clinical populations and to study gelotophobia within the range of normality. The fear of being laughed at has been studied with respect to such different variables as intelligence (self-rated and psychometric), character strengths (in self- and peer-ratings), humor
(questionnaires but also performance tests), or in cross cultural setting. The state of the art in research on gelotophobia is best summarized in Ruch (2009). A few recently published studies should be highlighted. Platt (2008) focused on the gelotophobes’ reaction towards two different kinds of laughter-related situations: harmless and playful teasing among colleagues and friends vs. mean-spirited bullying type of laughter. Gelotophobes are unable to differentiate between these situations and they experience negative emotions not only in the mean-spirited but also in the good-natured kind of teasing. Thus, one might conclude that gelotophobes tend to assume they are being laughed at (without this actually being the case). This indicates that “laughing with” (as a prosocial, reinforcing form of laughter) is mistakenly attributed as “being laughed at” in those who fear being laughed at. This misperception seems to be of relevance in research on bullying. Those who misperceive friendly forms of laughter as mean-spirited might be those who raise “false alarms” of having been bullied (see Platt, Proyer, & Ruch, in press).

Davies (2009) dealt with theoretical approaches to different expressions in gelotophobia with respect to the culture in the country (e.g., the role of shame, face, hierarchy, or status divisions among others). Ruch and Proyer (2009a) studied the localization of gelotophobes in the Eysenckian model of personality. Gelotobhobes turned out to be introverted neurotics that were higher in older variants of the psychotism scale that contain more clinically oriented items (e.g., paranoid tendencies). Papousek, Ruch, Freudenthaler, Kogler, Lang, and Schulter (2009) were interested in the emotion-related skills of gelotobhobes. Gelotobhobes indicated that they were weak in their attempts for emotion regulation and had a high tendency to control their emotions. However, experimental data suggests that deficits were based on intrapersonal emotion-related skills but not so in interpersonal skills (e.g., contagion of mood). In a study in a clinical realm, gelotophobia was high among schizophrenic patients and patients with personality disorders (primarily paranoids; Forabosco, Ruch, & Nucera, 2009).

Most recently, Ruch and Proyer (2009b) studied different ways of dealing with laughter in interaction situations. They were interested in the different roles that people may take. In this study, they described the fear of being laughed at in its relations to the joy of being laughed at (gelotophilia; making others laugh at oneself) and the joy of laughing at others (to put them down; katagelasticism). The authors developed a questionnaire for these three roles and found that gelotophobia and gelotophilia are negatively related (but are not interchangeable and do not seem to be low and high ends of a single dimension; i.e., the joy of being laughed at is not the absence of fearing to be laughed at). Gelotophilia and katagelasticism are positively related and there are gelotophobes who enjoy laughing at others but also those who do not enjoy laughing at others (i.e., zero-
correlation between gelotophobia and katagelasticism.

**Causes and Consequences of gelotophobia.**

Based on clinical observations by Titze, Ruch (2004) sketched a model of putative causes and consequences of gelotophobia (see also Ruch & Proyer, 2008a). The model is shown in Figure 1.

*Figure 1. A model of the putative causes and consequences of Gelotophobia as proposed by Titze (Ruch 2004).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causes</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infancy: development of primary shame failure to develop an interpersonal bridge (i.e., failing infant-caretaker interactions)</td>
<td>social withdrawal to avoid being laughed at / ridiculed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood &amp; youth: repeated traumatic experience of not being taken seriously (being laughed at / ridiculed) (e.g., bullying)</td>
<td>appear “cold as ice” / humourless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adulthood: intense traumatic experience of being laughed at or ridiculed (e.g., bullying)</td>
<td>low self-esteem, low social competences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Psychosomatic disturbances**
- breathing, tension headaches, trembling, dizziness, sleep disturbances

**Pinocchio-Syndrome**
- conceitment, clausury, “apologetic, wooden puppet”

**Lack of liveliness, spontaneity, joy**

**Humour/laughter are not relaxing & joyful social experiences**

Figure 1 shows that Titze traces the origins of gelotophobia back to infancy. There, the interaction between the infant and the caretaker(s) is impaired. This, and intense, repeated, and traumatic experiences of being laughed at or ridiculed lead to the development of gelotophobia. The consequences of gelotophobia are quite diverse. They go from social withdrawal to lack of liveliness, or the inability to appreciate laughter and smiling as joyful social experiences. However, this model is based on observations from case-studies and has not yet been fully tested empirically. There is some empirical evidence that contradicts the assumption in the model. For example, clinically diagnosed gelotophobes did not remember more incidents of having been laughed at in childhood and youth than normal controls (Ruch, Proyer, & Ventis, 2009). However, there is also support for parts of the model. For example, Proyer, Chen, and Ruch (in press) found lowered satisfaction with life and low endorsement of flow-related activities among gelotophobes in their study involving samples from Austria, China, and Switzerland. Likewise, the proposed social withdrawal goes along very well with the observed low scores in Extraversion (Ruch & Proyer, 2009a).
It should be noted that gelotophobia has relations to anxiety-related disorders. For example, the previously presented model suggests that extreme expressions of the fear of being laughed at would lead to social withdrawal, which is typically found in disorders like social phobia. Furthermore, Titze (2009) sees gelotophobia as a specific variant of shame-bound anxiety. There are preliminary empirical data that support the notion that there is a relation between gelotophobia and social anxiety disorders but that they are not fully overlapping; i.e., high scores in either social phobia or gelotophobia are not necessarily linked to higher expressions in the other. Thus, one might think of high gelotophobes that are not social phobic (but feel unease in situations involving smiling and laughter) and of social phobics that do not necessarily overwhelmingly fear being laughed at.

**Gelotophobia in Denmark**

Our primary expectation in this study was to consider how far Danes are likely not to show high levels of gelotophobia. The items in the questionnaire used seemed to be appropriate to explore in which kind of situations Danes feel to be subject of being laughed at or not. When choosing the participants (teachers) in the survey, the following consideration had been made. We expected that teachers might fear to be laughed at especially from their colleagues and the pupils they teach, as teachers in Denmark are allowed to choose the method used to teach freely on their own. In opposite to this one could expect, that popular teachers might be characterized by having a high level of self-esteem and self-assurance, which may result in low scores in gelotophobia.

**Aims of the present study**

The aim of the present study was threefold. Firstly, the psychometric properties of Danish translation of the gelotophobia-scale were examined. Therefore, reliability analyses and factor analyses were computed. The results were compared with the original German form (Ruch & Proyer, 2008b). Furthermore, the correlations of each item and the total score for gelotophobia with age, sex, and the marital status were computed. Secondly, the relevance of single items (i.e., symptoms) in terms of low vs. high agreements in the sample was evaluated. Thirdly, the application of the cut-off scores by Ruch and Proyer allowed for estimating how many gelotrophobes were in the sample (i.e., exceeding the cut-off scores).
Method

Sample
The sample consisted of $N = 247$ participants. 103 were males and 143 were females (one participant did not provide information on its gender). The mean of the age was 43.85 ($SD = 10.93$) and ranged from 19 to 63 years. 215 were in a relationship and the others were single, divorced, separated, or widowed.

Measure
The GELOPH<15> (Ruch & Proyer, 2008b) is a 15-item questionnaire for the subjective assessment of gelotophobia. All items are positively keyed and the 4-point answer format ranges from 1 = “strongly disagree” to 4 = “strongly agree”. The GELOPH is the standard instrument for the subjective assessment of gelotophobia and is widely used in research (see for example, Forabosco et al., 2009; Papousek et al., 2009; Platt, 2008; Ruch, 2009; Ruch & Proyer, 2009a). The Danish version is provided in Appendix I.

Procedure
The GELOPH<15> was translated from English to Danish and an independent bilingual person translated this version to English. The two English versions were compared and modifications were applied. The authors of the original version helped in critical cases. This procedure ensured that the original version was correctly but also that cultural specifications could be taken into account. In a first step 5 persons of the target group were asked to read the Geloph and indicated whether the questions appeared fully understandable or not. As the questions appeared fully understandable, the survey was carried out at six schools (grade 0-10) on the island of Sealand in Denmark. In the second step the questionnaire and the aim of the survey was orally presented to the participants and in the third step participants were instructed to complete the questionnaire within two weeks, and finally to place the completed questionnaire in a locked box placed at a central place in each school.

Results
The reliability analysis indicated that the Danish version yielded a high internal consistency ($\alpha = .84$) that is comparable to the original version. We also computed mean scores and standard deviations for each item separately and a total score. The items and the mean score in gelotophobia were correlated with age, sex, and marital status of the participants (see Table 1).
Table 1. Descriptive Statistics, Corrected Item Total Correlations, and Correlations with Age, Gender, and Marital Status for the Danish form of the 15-item GELOPH.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>CITC</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Ms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-2.28***</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-1.15*</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-2.22***</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-2.21**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-1.18**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-1.18**</td>
<td>-1.19**</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
<td>-2.26**</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>-1.14*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 11</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-2.21**</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-1.13*</td>
<td>-1.13*</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-2.27**</td>
<td>-2.26**</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 15</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-2.20**</td>
<td>-1.15*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 245-247. M = mean, SD = standard deviation; CITC = corrected item-total correlation; Age = correlation with age, Sex = correlation with sex (1 = males, 2 = females), Ms = correlation with marital status (1 = single; 2 = in a relationship). *p < .05; **p < .01.

Table 1 shows that the corrected item-total correlations ranged between .35 and .69 (M = .50). Gelotophobia was negatively correlated with age (i.e., the younger the participants the higher the expression of gelotophobia), negatively with sex (i.e., higher among males), and higher in participants that were in a relationship.

For the examination of the factorial structure (unidimensionality) of the scale we computed a principal components-analysis based on the intercorrelation among the 15 items. The analysis revealed one strong first factor. The eigenvalues were 5.06, 1.51, and 1.35, respectively. The first factor explained 33.76% of the variance. The loadings of the items on the first factor ranged between .43 (item 9; “When I have made an embarrassing impression somewhere, I avoid the place thereafter”) and .79 (item 4; “It is difficult for me to hold eye contact because I fear to be assessed in a disparaging way”). The median of the loading on the first factor was .59. Overall, a one-dimensional solution did fit the data best.

The answer categories of the questionnaire provide a possibility of estimating the relative importance of single items (symptoms). Therefore, we computed a total score of the two answer categories indicating agreement to an item (i.e., “agree” and “strongly agree”) and the frequency of the endorsement to each item.
was computed. The average item endorsement was 8.53% and the range was between .41% (item 8; “Although I frequently feel lonely, I have the tendency not to share social activities in order to protect myself from derision”) and 13.77% (item 13; “While dancing I feel uneasy because I am convinced that those watching me assess me as being ridiculous”).

The results so far show that there are single items that are relevant in Denmark but we also need information on how many persons in the sample exceeded the cut-off scores for gelotophobia. In the present sample there were 1.62% of the participants that exceeded the score indicating that gelotophobic symptoms apply (i.e., a mean score ≥ 2.50; see above and Ruch & Proyer for more information on the cut-off scores). 1.21% were characterized with slight and 0.40% with pronounced expressions.

Discussion

This is the first study that examined gelotophobia in Denmark. In the present study, there were less than 2% above the cut-off scores in a subjective measure that indicated at least slight expressions of the fear of being laughed at. This score is far lower than the one reported for Germany in Ruch and Proyer (2008b; i.e. 11.65%). However, as the present sample is not representative for Denmark it cannot be finally decided whether gelotophobia is of less importance in Denmark than in other countries. Nevertheless, the fear of being laughed at does not seem to be a concern in the everyday lives of Danes. Currently, a large cross-cultural research program on the fear of being laughed at has been started. One of the aims of this project is to identify what factors influence the country-wise expressions of gelotophobia. For example, one might think that individualism vs. collectivism might be useful in the interpretation of the results. Denmark has high scores in the well-known Hofstede (2001) dimension of individualism, which might indicate that Danes do not have to fear being laughed at and that this would reflect to their group. An ongoing study examines the relations of gelotophobia to self-conscious emotions (e.g., shame, guilt or pride; for an overview see Tangney & Dearing, 2002). Differences in the expressions of these emotions might also be of relevance in cross-cultural settings for understanding expressions of the fear of being laughed at in different countries. Other explanations might include the Power Distance Index or the gross national product, level of education, religiosity, the hierarchy-levels in a country (cf. Davies, 2009), or other psychological factors, such as expression of extraversion or neuroticism in a country. Still, more research is needed to closely identify potential contributors to the fear of being laughed at in different countries.
Experiences from German speaking countries show that the prevalence rates go up if samples were collected on special occasions. For example, in Proyer and Ruch (2009) there were more than 12% of gelotophobes in a Swiss-German sample (persons that were registering for a positive psychology program for fostering strengths of character), which is far higher than the usually found prevalence rates (more than double the size). Gelotophobia also seems to be more prevalent among victims of (workplace) bullying (see Platt, 2008). In a recent study, gelotophobia demonstrated to be a very potent predictor of self-reported experiences of having been bullied (Platt, Proyer, & Ruch, in press). This indicates that there might be specific groups of persons or specific situations (e.g., in organizational psychology, school psychology, clinical psychology etc.) in which gelotophobia might be an important contributor; even in countries with putatively lower countrywide expressions of the fear of being laughed at). Thus, more and more diverse groups from Denmark need to be surveyed.

The surprisingly low result of the study led to further reflection. For the participants chosen within this specific profession, the present result may lead to the conclusion that positive feedback and the daily experience of professional and individual success goes along with a low expectation of being laughed at. In addition it may be considered, that people with tendency to gelotophobia, probably not will choose schoolteacher as their profession.

The current data suggest that it seems to be fruitful to plan a follow-up study that includes a larger, more representative group of the Danish population with a larger range in demographic variables, as well as a more in depth study of the specific group investigated in this study, by using qualitative research instruments. Furthermore, studies with clinical groups seem to be of interest as well. Preliminary data suggests that there is a relation between high fear of being laughed at and anxiety-related disorders but that this relation is far from being overlapping. In clinical research, humour and humour-related variables do not seem to have been considered exhaustively. Performing literature searches in common scientific research engines (e.g., ISI web of knowledge, PubMed, Scopus) only provides a small number of hits for relevant terms. Thus, studying gelotophobia in relation to clinical groups might also contribute to a better understanding of these conditions. One might argue that this would be a step back to the origins in the case of social phobia. In 1901, French psychiatrist Paul Hartenberg described in his book "Les Timides et la Timidité" criteria for a condition that he called timidité that shows high convergence with the classification put forward in the DSM and ICD for social anxiety (or social phobia). His contribution was recently re-discovered by Fairbrother (2002). Hartenberg suggests that the timid people, in his conceptualization (i.e., the social phobics of our days), are fearful of self-disclosure and expressing their opinions because of a fear of ridicule.
Interestingly, gelotophobia was more prevalent among younger participants, females, and participants that were in a relationship. This is contrary to results from the German-speaking world. There were no age or gender differences (see Ruch, 2009; Ruch & Proyer, 2008b). Also, it was unexpected that people in a relationship feared being laughed more so than participants that were single. Further data will be needed to examine these relations in more detail. However, the present sample (with more aged persons in it than in the cited studies) might be an explanation.

The Danish version of the GELOPH yielded good psychometric properties and the one-dimensional factorial structure is highly comparable to the one reported for the German form (see Ruch & Proyer, 2008b). It seems to be a useful instrument for the assessment of the fear of being laughed at in Denmark. However, one of the aims of this article is also to stimulate research interests among researchers in Denmark. As the scientific study of gelotophobia has only recently begun, there are a lot of open questions that should be addressed in the future.
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Appendix I – Danish version of the GELOPH

**GELOPH**

Kode: ________________________________

Alder: [ ] [ ] [ ]

Køn: O mand  O kvinde

Er du: O ensig  O samlevende  O gift  O aktiv  O enkemann/kvinde

Instruktionen:

De følgende påstande refererer til dine fælless og indtryk generelt. Følg venligst at bekræfte dit allermindste afvist og opfattelse så godt som muligt, ved at afskrive et af de fire alternativer. Anvend venligst følgende skala.

(1) særdeles uenig
(2) modsat uenig
(3) modsat enig
(4) særdeles enig

P. eks.
Jeg er en hastig person ......................................................... (1) (2) (3) (4)

Hvis du er særdeles uenig i denne påstand, altid hvis du generelt er en hastig person, afskrive (4). Hvis du er modsat uenig, altid hvis du allermindstvis ikke er hastig overhovedet, afskrive (3). Hvis du har venskabelig ved at bevare et opsigsmål, så vælg det vær s.k. langt mest.

**Hvis venligst hvert opsigsmål, spring ingen over:**

1. Når andre læg i min tilstandeværelse bliver jeg misstået.

2. Jeg undgår at stå offentligt frem, fordi jeg frygter at finde mig i en uddragelig og vil forløbe nar af dem.

3. Når fremmede læg i min tilstandeværelse, tror jeg ofte de læg til mig.

4. Det er venskabeligt for mig at holde sigenkontakt, fordi jeg frygter at blive nedsettvende vedstærkt.

5. Når andre gør nar af med mig, føler jeg mig klemmet.

6. Jeg bestræber mig meget for ikke at vække negativ opmerksomhed, så jeg ikke virker letterlig.

7. Jeg tror jeg virker uindvirket letterlig på andre.

8. Selvom jeg ofte føler mig ensom, delager jeg i stedet almindelig til i sociale aktiviteter for at højlyte mig selv for almindelige bemærkninger.


10. Hvis jeg ikke var benge for at gøre mig selv til grus, ville jeg tale mere i foreningsløser.

11. Hvis us har drillet mig i fætten, kan jeg aldrig have angst at gøre med uddannet igen.

12. Det tager mig lang tid at komme over, når nogen har grinet af mig.

13. Når jeg daneker føler jeg mig skadelig, fordi jeg er overhovedet om at det der se mig synes jeg er letterlig.

14. Når jeg føler mig relativt ubehersket, er der ingen risiko for at tilbringe negativ opmerksomhed eller virke uindvirket.

15. Når jeg har gjort mig til grus overfor andre, bliver jeg totalt stiv og minner mine om at det opsig mig pæntest.

Se venligst efter, om du har været på alle udsagn