

BROCK UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



3 9157 00931473 6

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY
1100 EAST 58TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

Acquired from the University of Chicago Library

Acquired from the University of Chicago Library

Acquired from the University of Chicago Library

Acquired from the University of Chicago Library

Acquired from the University of Chicago Library

Acquired from the University of Chicago Library

Acquired from the University of Chicago Library

Acquired from the University of Chicago Library

Acquired from the University of Chicago Library

Acquired from the University of Chicago Library

Acquired from the University of Chicago Library

Acquired from the University of Chicago Library

**Towards the Development of a Questionnaire of Post Transgression Motives and
Behaviours**

by

Jessica Rourke

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Master of Arts

Department of Psychology
BROCK UNIVERSITY
St. Catharines, Ontario

November 20, 2006

© Jessica Rourke, 2006

Abstract

The primary purpose of this study was to develop a questionnaire that assesses both forgiveness-seeking motives and behaviours. This questionnaire was based on the premise that, following the commitment of an offense in the context of a relationship, a perpetrator will be motivated to reduce the damage that has taken place. The questionnaire examined several motives that a perpetrator might have for seeking forgiveness. These motives were divided into five proposed domains of post-transgression concerns: God, Self, Victim, Others/Society, and Relationship. Within these domains, the following more specific types of concern were explored: Avoidance of punishment, concern about public image, emotional well-being, self-image, sense of fairness/justice, loss of relationship, loss or gain of power, and loss of ability to trust. The questionnaire also assessed which behaviours (approach and avoidance) a perpetrator might use in order to address these concerns. In addition, this study explored whether or not the severity of the situation and the personality of the perpetrator influenced post transgression motives and behaviours. Participants were 221 individuals from the community and Brock University. They filled out a questionnaire package that assessed personality traits, social desirability, and forgiveness-seeking motives and behaviours. In order to answer items assessing motives and behaviours, participants were asked to imagine themselves as perpetrators in three hypothetical transgression scenarios. These scenarios ranged in severity from low to high. Participants were asked to rate their motives and behaviours both in an immediate time frame (immediately following the transgression) and in the long-term (in order to move on from the situation). Results indicated that the motivation items could be classified into the following subscales:

Concern about God, Damaged Self-worth Concerns, Justice Concerns, Impression Management Concerns, Victim and Others Concerns, and Relationship Concerns. The behaviour items formed the following subscales: Approach, Avoidance, Denial and Hiding, and Groveling. Results also indicated differences in motivations and behaviours based on the severity of the situation as well as the personality (assessed using the HEXACO inventory) of the perpetrator.

Acknowledgements

The completion of such a large project could never have happened without the guidance, support, and patience of many people.

First and foremost, I must extend my gratitude to my mentor, and thesis advisor, Dr. Kathryn Belicki. Dr. Belicki was always on-hand with new perspectives, constructive criticism, and kind words of encouragement. I feel privileged to have had the opportunity to work with such a wonderful person, and such a brilliant mind. Thank you Kathy, for going above and beyond the duty of a thesis advisor.

I must also extend my thanks to my committee members: Dr. Nancy DeCourville, and Dr. Stan Sadava, both of whom were very patient and offered many words of wisdom. In addition, I must thank the external member of my committee, Dr. Virginia Todd Holeman, who took time out of her very busy schedule to read my thesis, participate in my defense, and offer her valuable input.

Many thanks to all of my friends, especially to Kimberley Nicholls, Leanne Gosse, and Carole Moss. I would also like to extend many thanks to my extended family, my God-parents (Guy and Lise Falardeau), the Coll Family, and all of my wonderful participants.

Last, but certainly far from least, I would like to thank my parents and my son, Calaen. To my parents, thank you for all of your support and encouragement, and also for your help packing, when I was desperately trying to finish this thesis and preparing to move across the country. To my angel Cal, thanks for understanding that for the past few months, more times than not, Mommy has had to work on her thesis and could only play “for a little while.” Throughout it all, you helped keep a smile on my face; thanks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF APPENDICES	xi
INTRODUCTION	1
Benefits of forgiveness	2
Issues concerning the definition of forgiveness.....	5
Seeking forgiveness (or not)	10
Forgiveness-seeking motives and behaviours.....	13
Building a forgiveness-seeking measure	30
Forgiveness-seeking and personality (HEXACO).....	33
Summary	37
METHOD	39
Study 1 (pilot study).....	39
Participants.....	39
Materials	39
Demographics	39
Offender Scenarios.....	39
Procedure	40
Results and discussion	42
Study 2	44
Participants.....	44
Materials	47
Demographics	47
Personality (HEXACO)	48
Social Desirability (BIDR)	48
Forgiveness-seeking questionnaire	49
Comments questionnaire.....	55
Procedure	55
Data analyses	58
RESULTS	60
Data verification.....	60
Analyses for motivation items	61
Preliminary factor analyses.....	61
Reliability analyses	64
Correlation analyses.....	68
Final reliability analyses	78
Test re-test analysis.....	78
Final factor analysis	81
Behaviours	81
Preliminary analyses	81
Factor analyses.....	81
Reliability analyses	82
Test re-test analysis.....	84

Correlation analyses.....	85
Final factor analysis	87
Social desirability.....	87
Reliability analyses	87
Correlation analyses.....	88
Personality (HEXACO) analyses.....	91
Reliability analyses	91
BIDR and HEXACO correlation analyses.....	91
Motivation and HEXACO correlation analyses	92
Behaviour and HEXACO correlation analyses.....	94
Motives and behaviours	97
Correlation analyses between motive and behaviour subscales	97
Sex differences.....	104
Sex differences for motives and behaviours	104
Assessment of scenario differences	105
Scenario severity	105
Motivation concern differences within scenarios	107
Behavioural differences within scenarios	113
Personality (HEXACO) differences within scenarios	116
Needing forgiveness to move on.....	123
DISCUSSION	126
Motivation.....	126
Emergence of forgiveness-seeking motivation subscales.....	126
Reliability of the subscales	127
Validity of the subscales	129
The final subscales.....	132
Forgiveness-seeking motives and personality (HEXACO)	136
Behaviours	137
Emergence of forgiveness-seeking behaviour subscales	137
Reliability of the subscales	138
Validity of the subscales	138
Forgiveness-seeking behaviours and personality (HEXACO)	139
Forgiveness-seeking behaviours and the link to motivation.....	141
Differences due to severity	143
Severity differences in motivation.....	143
Severity differences in behaviours.....	144
Scenario differences based on personality (HEXACO).....	145
Limitations of study and conclusions	146
REFERENCES	151
APPENDICES	174

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Means and standard deviations for all scenarios, arranged in order of mean severity ranking.....	43
Table 2. Participants occupation	46
Table 3. Religions affiliation of participants	46
Table 4. Forgiveness-seeking items by general domain and specific area of concerns...	50
Table 5. Forgiveness-seeking behaviours by domain.....	56
Table 6. Motivation items deleted from analyses due to missing data	62
Table 7. Domains, subscales and corresponding items.....	65
Table 8. Mean inter-item correlation items and alphas for reduced subscales	69
Table 9. Correlations (N) among subscales for the immediate time frame	72
Table 10. Correlations (N) among subscales for the long-term time frame	74
Table 11. Correlations (N) of each subscale with itself at the immediate versus long term time frame.....	76
Table 12. Correlations between subscales (immediate and long-term time frames combined)	79
Table 13. Correlations between final subscales.....	79
Table 14. Mean inter-item correlations for new, collapsed subscales	80
Table 15. Test re-test correlations for motive subscales.....	83
Table 16. Behaviour subscales and relevant items	85
Table 17. Mean inter-item correlations, alphas, and test re-test correlations for reduced behaviour subscales.....	86
Table 18. Correlations (N) of behaviour subscales within each time frame.....	87
Table 19. Correlations (N) of each subscale with itself at the immediate versus long-term time frame.....	78
Table 20. Cronbach's alpha for the two BIDR scoring methods	88

Table 21. Correlations (N) between the BIDR and the motive subscales	89
Table 22. Correlations (N) between the HEXACO and the motive subscales, immediate time frame	92
Table 23. Correlations (N) between the HEXACO and the motive subscales, long- term time frame.....	93
Table 24. Correlations between the HEXACO and the motive subscales, time frames combined.....	95
Table 25. Correlations (N) between the HEXACO and the behaviour subscales, immediate time frame	95
Table 26. Correlations (N) between the HEXACO and the behaviour subscales, long- term time frame.....	95
Table 27. Correlations between the HEXACO and the behaviour subscales, time frames combined.....	96
Table 28. Significant correlations between the motive subscales and the Approach subscale	98
Table 29. Significant correlations between the motive subscales and the Avoidance subscale	99
Table 30. Significant correlations between the motive subscales and the Denial and Hiding subscale.....	101
Table 31. Significant correlations between the motive subscales and the Groveling subscale	102
Table 32. Means (M) and standard deviations (SD) for motive subscales	108
Table 33. Significant ANOVA results for motive subscales	110
Table 34. Post-hoc comparisons: Motive subscale differences for the immediate time frame	110
Table 35. Post-hoc comparisons: Motive subscale differences for the long-term time frame	111
Table 36. Post-hoc comparisons: Motive subscale differences for the time frames combined.....	112

Table 37. Means (M) and standard deviations (SD) for behaviour subscales	114
Table 38. Significant ANOVA results for behaviour subscales	115
Table 39. Post-hoc comparisons: Behaviour subscale differences for the immediate time frame	115
Table 40. Post-hoc comparisons: Behaviour subscale differences for the long-term time frame	116
Table 41. Post-hoc comparisons: Behaviour subscale differences for the time frames combined.....	116
Table 42. Significant correlations between Honesty-Humility and the motive subscales	117
Table 43. Significant correlations between Emotionality and the motive subscales.....	117
Table 44. Significant correlations between Extraversion and the motive subscales	118
Table 45. Significant correlations between Agreeableness and the motive subscales	119
Table 46. Significant correlations between Conscientiousness and the motive subscales	119
Table 47. Significant correlations between Openness to Experience and the motive subscales	120
Table 48. Significant correlations between Honesty-Humility and the behaviour subscales	121
Table 49. Significant correlations between Emotionality and the behaviour subscales	122
Table 50. Significant correlations between Extraversion and the behaviour subscales	122
Table 51. Significant correlations between Agreeableness and the behaviour subscales	122
Table 52. Significant correlations between Openness to Experience and the behaviour subscales	123
Table 53. Frequencies for first place rankings: “I would need forgiveness from...in	

order to move on from the situation”	125
--	-----

Table 54. Means and standard deviations for rankings: “I would need forgiveness from...in order to move on from the situation”	125
---	-----

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Study 1 scenarios (in order of severity)	174
Appendix B. Study 1 post scenario questions.....	175
Appendix C. Study 1 informed consent.....	176
Appendix D. Study 1 debriefing form	177
Appendix E. Demographic questionnaire	178
Appendix F. Palhaus Social Desirability Inventory (BIDR)	179
Appendix G. Formatted forgiveness questionnaire	180
Appendix H. Comments questionnaire	181
Appendix I. Verbal script.....	182
Appendix J. Session 1 consent form	183
Appendix K. Session 1 debriefing letter	184
Appendix L. Information letter	185
Appendix M. Session 2 consent form	186
Appendix N. Session 2 debriefing letter	187

Introduction

Humans are social beings with an innate need to belong to a group (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Fincham, 2000; Hall & Lindzey, 1978). Our social relationships are extremely important to us and provide us with support and a sense of security (Karremans, Van Lange, Ouwerkerk, & Klewer, 2003). A rift in such relationships captures our energy and attention, because it may disrupt that support and sense of security. A powerful tool that can enable us to move on from a transgression, and perhaps even to reconcile a broken relationship, is forgiveness (Baumeister, Exline, & Sommer, 1998). In fact, forgiveness may actually be an adaptive mechanism (Fincham 2000). After all, the existence of social harmony is ultimately the product of our ability to move on and repair relationships after a transgression (Exline, Baumeister, Bushman, Campbell, & Finkel, 2004).

One of the factors that makes forgiveness more likely is forgiveness-seeking (e.g., Fow, 1996). It may be that forgiveness-seeking behaviours, such as an apology, make the victim feel safer in granting forgiveness because they suggest that the perpetrator is remorseful. Yet, in spite of the apparent usefulness of forgiveness-seeking, psychological research has predominately focused on the granting of forgiveness. In light of this, there seems to be a need to redress this imbalance. This thesis is a first step in the development of a general measure aimed to be useful in a variety of forgiveness-seeking studies.

In the following introduction, I first review studies that address the benefits of granting forgiveness. These benefits also speak indirectly to the benefits of forgiveness-seeking, because the seeking of forgiveness generally increases the likelihood of the granting of forgiveness. I then turn to the issues surrounding definitions of forgiveness,

noting that certain definitions make it more likely that forgiveness researchers will ignore the importance of forgiveness-seeking. Following this, studies of forgiveness-seeking will be reviewed with the aim of demonstrating the importance of investigating and measuring forgiveness-seeking motives and behaviours. Finally, as a means of establishing construct validity of the new measure, the relation of personality to forgiveness-seeking will be considered.

Benefits of forgiveness

Consider the following Japanese folktale:

Tanzen and Ekido were travelling together down a muddy path. A heavy rain was falling; the mud was deep. As they passed through the village, they came upon a lovely young woman in a silk kimono and obbe sash, unable to cross the muddy intersection. Tanzen stopped, bowed, and asked, "May I be of help?" Then he lifted her in his arms and carried her gently across the streets. Ekido did not speak again to Tanzen until they had arrived at a lodging temple late that night. Then he could no longer restrain himself. "How could you do such a thing?" he asked. "We monks do not go near females, especially not young and lovely ones. It is dangerous. Why did you do that?"

"I left the girl there," said Tanzen. "You are still carrying her."

(Augsburger, 1992, p. 260).

This folktale nicely illustrates that for some, incidents are easily left behind while for others, these same incidents provoke negative feelings or thoughts, that

must be addressed before they can be let go.

It is precisely for these individuals who continue to be plagued by the effects of a transgression, whether mild or severe, that researchers in the field of psychology became involved with the topic of forgiveness. Psychological research on this topic, however, is still in its infancy as, previous to the mid 1980's, forgiveness was a topic broached only by philosophers and theologians (Enright, Eastin, Golden, Sarinopoulos, & Freedman 1992; McCullough & Witvliet, 2002). The focus of both the philosophical and theological disciplines were, and continue to be, the moral issues of forgiveness. The foci in psychology on the other hand, have been more clinical, examining which factors of a situation and which characteristics of a person predict forgiveness, and also, the consequences of engaging in such a process (Exline, Worthington Jr., Hill, & McCullough, 2003; Hope, 1987).

From a psychological perspective, forgiveness is an important topic to study both as an interpersonal process between the victim and perpetrator/wrong-doer, and as an intrapersonal (self) process. As an interpersonal process, forgiveness is the mechanism by which damaged relationships may be repaired. Transgressions can have deep psychological effects on a person, which can be just as, if not more, painful and devastating than any physical injury (Leary & Springer, 1998). Extensive research has demonstrated a very plausible relationship between unforgiveness and both physical and mental health problems such as depression, guilt, anxiety, chronic anger, general distress, and addictive behaviours (e.g., Leary & Springer, 1998; Worthington, Mazzeo, & Kliewer, 2002). There also exist preliminary findings of relations between forgiveness

and physical health, including superior sleep quality and less fatigue (Lawler et al., 2005), less chronic back pain, less anger, less depression, and less anxiety (Carson et al., 2005); lower heart rate, lower blood pressure, and increased immune system functioning (Harrar, 2002; Lawler et al., 2003).

Based on the apparent link between forgiveness and health, some clinical researchers have gone on to test the efficacy of therapeutic interventions designed to promote forgiveness. Several of these have been determined to be effective in increasing forgiveness and reducing concomitant distress (e.g., McCullough & Worthington Jr., 1995). These include interventions conducted with individuals in close interpersonal relationships (Murray, 2002), survivors of incest (Freedman & Enright, 1996), and men who opposed a partner's decision to have an abortion (Coyle & Enright, 1997).

In sum, while it is beyond the scope of this thesis to review the literature in detail, granting forgiveness has been associated with many positive outcomes. However, the direction of causality has not definitely been established. It may be well be that individuals who are healthier, both physically and emotionally, possess a greater ability to grant forgiveness (e.g., McCullough, & Worthington, 1994). Moreover, there are some who view forgiveness as harmful in certain instances, such as when an abuse victim forgives his/her abuser and, as a result, returns to an abusive relationship (Berecz, 2001). Despite these issues, forgiveness clearly has the potential to be a beneficial process. Based on this conclusion, it is important to research the factors, such as forgiveness-seeking, that increase the likelihood that forgiveness will occur. Before delving into the topic of forgiveness-seeking, however, some time must be devoted to exploring the

debates concerning the definition of forgiveness, and whether or not forgiveness is a process which is interpersonal, intrapersonal, or both.

Issues Concerning the Definition of Forgiveness

Researchers in the field have not reached a consensus in how to define forgiveness (Berry, Worthington, O'Connor, Parrott III, & Wade, 2005; McCullough, Pargament, & Thoresen, 2000). This results in numerous problems, one of which being that how one defines forgiveness shapes one's view regarding the importance of behaviours such as forgiveness-seeking. North (1987) has gone so far as to claim that defining forgiveness may actually be impossible. However, it has been possible for researchers to be almost unanimous in regard to what forgiveness is not. The majority of forgiveness researchers are of the mind that forgiveness is not forgetting, pardoning, excusing, or condoning (Enright 1991; Enright, Freedman, & Rique, 1998; Exline et al., 2003; Fincham & Kashdan, in press; North, 1987; Thompson et al., 2005). To be more specific, forgetting is erasing any trace of the transgression from memory; pardoning is something that is done within the boundaries of the legal system (Enright, 1991; Enright et al., 1992; Exline et al., 2003; Fincham & Kashdan, in press); and condoning and excusing strip the offense of any responsibility on the part of the perpetrator, leaving the victim with nothing to forgive (Enright, 1991; Fincham & Kashdan, in press).

Of great relevance to this thesis, and to the forgiveness-seeking process in general, is that the majority of researchers also think that forgiveness is not reconciliation (Enright et al., 1992; Enright et al., 1998; Fincham & Kashdan, in press; Thompson et al., 2005). There are however, a select few who insist that reconciliation and forgiveness are

synonymous, or at least inextricably linked (Girard & Mullet, 1997; Hargrave & Sells, 1997; Veenstra, 1992) because ultimately, to forgive means to reestablish the damaged relationship (Girard & Mullet, 1997). Those researchers who differentiate forgiveness from reconciliation, assert that reconciliation entails the restoring of trust and commitment in a relationship. Thus, reconciliation requires the active participation of both the wrong-doer and the victim (Enright et al., 1998; Fincham, 2000; Fincham & Beach, 2001; Fow, 1996; Holeman, 2003; Rusbult, Hannon, Stocker, & Finkel, 2005; Worthington Jr., 2001; Worthington Jr. & Drinkard, 2000), whereas forgiveness may be conceptualized as something that only involves the victim. By this argument, concern that forgiveness is harmful is not relevant because victims can forgive and reap the beneficial consequences of such an action, and not have to enter back into any relationship with the perpetrator.

Such separating of forgiveness from reconciliation makes it easy for researchers to virtually ignore the wrong-doer's role in the process of post-transgression resolution, and this may be one of the reasons that there exists so little research on forgiveness-seeking. However, the separation of reconciliation from forgiveness may very well be the conceptual product of an individualistic society, as not all societies make this same distinction. Societies with a more collectivistic orientation tend to blur the distinction between forgiveness and reconciliation (e.g., the Samoan practice of *Ifoga*, Filoiali'i, & Knowles, 1983). For instance, Bishop Desmond Tutu (1999), in his book, "No Future Without Forgiveness" tends to use the words forgiveness and reconciliation interchangeably. Indeed, even in our individualistic society, many individuals outside the

academic context associate forgiveness with reconciliation (Belicki, DeCourville, Michalica, Stewart, & Williams, 2003; DeCourville, Belicki, & Green, 2005; Kanz, 2000). Moreover, the majority of forgiveness researchers who view forgiveness and reconciliation as distinct state that forgiveness promotes reconciliation (e.g., Fincham & Beach, 2001). Therefore, even though forgiveness and reconciliation can be conceptually differentiated, given their association in actual practice, it is important to learn more about the post transgression behaviours of wrong-doers.

A second definitional issue relevant to this thesis is whether “genuine” forgiveness is experienced merely by getting rid of the negative thoughts, feelings and behaviours, or whether these must be replaced by positive thoughts, feelings and behaviours towards the perpetrator. On the one hand, are those who claim that forgiveness need not include harbouring any positive emotions towards the perpetrator. Forgiveness from this point of view is about overcoming the anger, resentment, sorrow, disappointment, desire for revenge, and any other negative thoughts, feelings, and behaviours that are the result of having been transgressed against (Hughes, 1993; Rusbult et al., 2005). Those with this perspective advocate that it is unreasonable to claim that a victim who states that he/she has forgiven, and has diminished his/her negative stance towards the wrong-doer, has not actually genuinely forgiven because he/she lacks positive emotions towards the perpetrator (Neblett, 1974).

On the other side of the debate, researchers insist “genuine” forgiveness not only means getting rid of the negative, but also embracing the positive (Berry et al., 2005; McCullough, 2000; 2001; McCullough & Witvliet, 2002; McCullough & Worthington,

1999). In this view, forgiveness means that the victim releases his/her right to resentment, rage, hatred, anger, bitterness, and desire for avoidance and revenge, and instead, views the perpetrator positively, generously, compassionately, and with feelings of love (Enright, 1991; Enright et al., 1998; Fincham & Beach, 2001; Govier & Verwoerd, 2002; North, 1987; 1998). From this stance, any type of forgiveness that does not include both the elimination of the negative and the appearance of the positive is not genuine forgiveness. For instance, Enright (2001) claims that this is actually “pseudo-forgiveness,” while Baumeister et al. (1998) label it “hollow forgiveness.”

However, victims who do replace negative feelings, thoughts, and behaviours with positive ones may well be more likely to reconcile with their wrong-doers. Therefore, when forgiveness is defined in this way, the motives and behaviours of the perpetrator become more relevant than when forgiveness is defined merely as the letting go of the negative. In short, the consequence of the differing definitions of forgiveness is that the view that focuses only on the letting go of the negative will stimulate research that is centred only on the individual (victim), while the view that includes the adoption of the positive will increase the importance of studying the perpetrator.

A final debate of relevance to this thesis is whether forgiveness is an interpersonal or intrapersonal process. Forgiving for interpersonal reasons is a relational process, with victims forgiving their perpetrators in order to try to repair the relationship (Enright, 1991; Enright & the HDSG, 1996). Forgiving for intrapersonal reasons is a process that is directed at the self and not the wrong-doer, with victims forgiving in order to help themselves release their resentment and other negative emotions, in hopes of being able

to let go and feel better (Enright & the HDSG, 1996). There are many who advocate that forgiveness is an interpersonal gift to the perpetrator (Enright, 1996; Enright et al., 1998; Girard & Mullet, 1997). Stemming from this point of view, Worthington Jr. (1998) and Karremans, and Van Lange (2004) believe that forgiveness is an interpersonal process, with the victim releasing the perpetrator from the cycle of revenge and avoidance. Worthington Jr. (1998) goes on to speculate that this interpersonal process is mediated by empathy towards the perpetrator.

While some claim that forgiveness is solely interpersonal, others argue that forgiveness is purely an intrapersonal process (e.g., Thompson & Snyder, 2004), and that it is the reconciliation process that is interpersonal. There exist two problems with this view of forgiveness. First, as noted above, the majority of people outside of academia do not view it in this way (Belicki et al., 2003; Kanz, 2000). Second, at a conceptual level, viewing forgiveness as purely intrapersonal makes it difficult to differentiate forgiveness from merely feeling better, or some other type of post-injury recovery. Furthermore, advocating a wholly intrapersonal operational definition of forgiveness completely excludes the role of the perpetrator in the process, despite the fact that we know that perpetrator behaviour influences forgiveness (e.g. McCullough et al., 1998; Worthington Jr., 1998).

While there are some who stand on either side of the debate, there are also those (including myself) who believe that forgiveness can be both interpersonal and intrapersonal. For instance, Andrews (2000) calls interpersonal forgiveness “negotiated forgiveness,” something that occurs between the wrong-doer and the victim, with the

perpetrator admitting to having harmed the victim and showing remorse. Andrews terms intrapersonal forgiveness “unilateral forgiveness,” something that occurs purely within the individual and is not affected by whether or not the perpetrator feels remorse, or even acknowledges that the harm has occurred. While McCullough et al. (2000) also believe that forgiveness is both interpersonal and intrapersonal, they hold the belief that forgiveness is primarily interpersonal due to the fact that it is a response to a transgression in the context of an interpersonal relationship. For them, the intrapersonal aspect of forgiveness exists in the change from negative to positive that occurs within the victim. Perhaps the best resolution comes from Decourville and colleagues who have argued that researchers ought not to restrict the complex process of forgiveness to merely one definition (DeCourville & Belicki, 2004; DeCourville et al., 2005)

For the purpose of this thesis, forgiveness is understood to be, for many individuals (albeit not all), an interpersonal process that is frequently associated with a greater likelihood of reconciliation due to increased positive emotions, thoughts, and behaviours towards the perpetrator. Such a view makes the post-transgression behaviour of the wrong-doer important to study because such forgiveness is more risky than forgiveness that is purely intrapersonal and/or focused just on releasing negative emotions.

Seeking Forgiveness (or Not)

The preponderance of research on forgiveness from the victim’s perspective (forgiveness-granting) has left a gap in this field of research. This is perplexing because an interpersonal transgression, the very starting point of forgiveness, involves at least two

people - a victim and a perpetrator. However, we have seen that how one defines forgiveness could deflect attention away from the perpetrator. It may also be that there has been a desire to come to the aid of the victim, suffering unjustly at the hands of the perpetrator. Exploring forgiveness-seeking may not only be beneficial to the well-being of wrong-doers, but may also serve to further enhance the well-being of victims.

Following a transgression, a victim often experiences a variety of negative thoughts, feelings, and behaviours. For instance, a victim may be left traumatized and mourning the loss of the relationship (Akhtar, 2002). Often, a victim interprets a transgression as the perpetrator having devalued the relationship and consequently, experiences a loss of self-esteem and self-worth (Baumeister et al. 1998; Brandsma, 1982; Hodgins & Liebeskind, 2003; Leary & Springer, 1998). In addition, the victim may be left feeling frustrated (Brandsma, 1982), powerless (Baures, 1996), and fearful that he/she will be hurt again (Leary & Springer, 1998). All of these negative feelings, coupled with the feelings of anger, bitterness and the desire for revenge that were mentioned above, can lead the victim to harbour a grudge against the wrong-doer. One author describes how he feels about someone against whom he has held a grudge for years, "This guy's such an incredible schmuck, let's not even dignify him with a phony name. We'll just call him Ratface – and that's defaming the rodent community" (Dreher, 2000, p. 54). Clearly, although the incident happened many years before, the negative feelings towards the perpetrator are still very fresh in the victim. In Australia, there exists a flower shop, "Drop Dead Flowers" that comes to the aid of jilted lovers bearing a grudge. This shop organizes revenge packages that range from a single dead rose to 13

dead roses and a box of melted chocolates wrapped in black paper and sent in a black box (Fitness, 2001).

How a wrong-doer behaves post-transgression can address the negativity experienced by the victim(s). For instance, certain post-transgression behaviours on the part of the perpetrator may help to restore a sense of value to the relationship and a sense of safety for the victim. In light of this, it is not surprising that research has demonstrated forgiveness is easier to grant if a perpetrator has engaged in some form of forgiveness-seeking (e.g., Fincham, 2000; Girard & Mullet, 1997; Kelley, 1998). Despite this knowledge, as stated above, some argue that a victim may be capable of overcoming all of the negativity without the perpetrator seeking forgiveness. While this may very well be true of some, there are many victims who do require some sort of forgiveness-seeking action from the perpetrator. One such victim, speaking on behalf of many others at the Chilean National Commission on Truth and Reconciliation (investigating the rights violations that occurred in Chile between 1973-1990), explained this need, "I am ready to forgive, but I need to know who I have to forgive. If they would just speak up and acknowledge what they have done, they would be giving us the opportunity to forgive" (Berryman, 1995, p. 800, as cited in Andrews, 2000, p. 75).

Seeking forgiveness not only aids victims in granting forgiveness, but it can also be beneficial for perpetrators. After transgressing against someone, a perpetrator is often left feeling unworthy, ashamed, guilty (Enright & the HDSG, 1996; Kelln, & Ellard, 1999; Konstam, Chernoff, & Deveney, 2001; Leith & Baumeister, 1998; Tangney, Boone, & Dearing, 2005), embarrassed (Miller & Tangney, 1994), angry, doubting

himself/herself, unhappy (Stone, 2002), and with a lower sense of self-esteem (Holmgren, 1993; Fincham & Beach, 2001; Stone, 2002). A perpetrator may also experience self-hatred and a loss of self-respect (Hall & Fincham, 2005). If these negative feelings continue, the wrong-doer may end up anxious, depressed, and/or feeling vulnerable (Ross, Kendall, Matters, Wrobel, & Rye, 2004). Being forgiven can greatly help to reduce all of these negative feelings and thoughts.

Forgiveness-seeking Motives and Behaviours

In developing a measure of forgiveness-seeking, I adopted the premise that following the commitment of an offense in the context of a relationship, a perpetrator will be motivated to reduce the damage that has taken place. Consistent with this, in a study conducted by Witvliet, Ludwig, and Bauer (2002), where participants described their experience with seeking forgiveness from a victim, 90% stated that they valued forgiveness. This seems to suggest that the majority of perpetrators are motivated to try to obtain forgiveness. Based on this, the first point to address is what factors motivate a perpetrator to engage in forgiveness-seeking. The next step is to establish what behaviours may be driven by these motivations, as there are numerous possible responses to a transgression, all of which may have similar or different motivations underlying them (Thompson et al., 2005). Kelley (1998) has similarly differentiated between motives and behaviours associated with forgiveness-seeking.

There exist different types of damage following a transgression, and it is likely that individuals vary in the type of damage that affects them. For example, psychopathic individuals might be most concerned about the negative consequences to themselves,

while individuals high in empathy might be most concerned about the victim's hurt, and religious individuals might be most concerned about their religious or moral standing. In addition, depending on the damage or concern following the transgression, there are many different forgiveness-seeking strategies that can be adopted. The goal of this thesis was to develop a measure that would encompass a broad range of motives (as reflected in the type of damage that concerns the individual) as well as to assess a wide range of forgiveness-seeking behaviour strategies.

To begin, similar to forgiveness-granting, forgiveness-seeking can be either interpersonal or intrapersonal. If a perpetrator desires to reconcile the relationship and/or help the victim to feel better, forgiveness will be sought from the victim, and is thus interpersonal. If the perpetrator turns inwards to come to terms with the negativity he/she is feeling, and in no way involves the victim, the perpetrator is seeking forgiveness from himself/herself and is thus engaging in intrapersonal forgiveness-seeking.

From an interpersonal point of view, it may be that wrong-doers feel they need to receive forgiveness from their victims in order to be able to fully move on from the situation. Transgressing against someone can bring a perpetrator's moral character into question (Gonzales, Manning, & Haugen, 1992), and receiving forgiveness from the one who was harmed may be a sign to the perpetrator that his/her moral worth has been re-established in the eyes of others. In a study on how perpetrators felt after receiving forgiveness, it was found that receiving forgiveness rarely resulted in making the perpetrator feel negatively (e.g., embarrassed, guilty, or angry). Instead, joy and relief were the most common feelings, reported by 60% of the participants (Gassin, 1998).

There exist no studies that systematically explore why perpetrators need to seek forgiveness from their victim; however, the study by Witvliet et al. (2002) demonstrates that interpersonal forgiveness-seeking is something that is important to many. In that study, participants were asked to imagine they were seeking forgiveness from someone whom they had previously hurt. Of the 62.5% of participants who had not been fully forgiven, 68% expressed that it was important to them to receive this forgiveness from their victim. In addition, when participants imagined seeking forgiveness versus imagining only the transgression, they felt significantly less sadness, anger, guilt, shame, and arousal, and felt more hope.

In addition to interpersonal forgiveness-seeking, intrapersonal forgiveness-seeking can also play an important role in the wrong-doer's ability to heal and move on from the situation (Snow, 1993). A parable from the life of Buddha depicts the importance of self-forgiveness: A man's son is very ill, and the man goes to Buddha, asking for help. Buddha keeps his eyes closed and stays silent. The man's son dies and the man returns to Buddha enraged. He shouts at, curses at, and spits on Buddha. Many years later, the man returns to Buddha, extremely remorseful and apologetic. Buddha opens his eyes and says to the man,

"You spat on a river and the water flowed away. The man I was then is gone with time. I am different. You did not spit on me and hence I have no authority to forgive you. But it makes me sad that while you have learnt many things, you are standing on the same spot on the riverbank. You are being consumed by a moment that has long ago departed. It is not I, but

you and only you, who can release yourself from this bondage” (Akhtar, 2002, p. 207).

Brandsma (1982) and Holmgren (1998) have suggested that forgiveness of the self is a process that requires that the perpetrator become aware of his/her motives for the transgression, and the impact that the transgression has had on the victim. Self-forgiveness can allow the perpetrator to reduce his/her feelings of shame (Leach & Lark, 2004) and move on from the situation by restoring his/her self-respect (Dillon, 2001; Hall & Fincham, 2005; Holmgren, 1998). In essence, self-forgiveness is reconciling with the self (Enright & the HDSG, 1996; Hall & Fincham, 2005). It allows the wrong-doer to forgive himself/herself for having injured someone else, and also, for having let himself/herself down. This permits the perpetrator to become at peace with the transgression and any consequences that it manifested (Hall & Fincham, 2005).

The controversy over whether forgiveness is an interpersonal or intrapersonal process is slightly different in the context of forgiveness-seeking because researchers agree that a perpetrator can, and often does engage in both types. Instead, the debate is about which type of forgiveness-seeking occurs first: Does the wrong-doer first seek forgiveness from the victim, and then from himself/herself, or vice-versa, and if one type of forgiveness-seeking is achieved, is the other even necessary? Some researchers are adamant that self-forgiveness (intrapersonal) need only occur when relational forgiveness (interpersonal) is impossible (Enright, 1996; Govier & Verwoerd, 2002; Snow, 1993). From this point of view, relational forgiveness is the ultimate goal of forgiveness, with self-forgiveness existing only as an alternative so that if receiving forgiveness from the

victim does not occur, the perpetrator can forgive himself/herself and move on from the transgression. Loewen (1970), Mills (1995) and North (1998) on the other hand, believe that self-forgiveness must be the perpetrator's first priority. They argue that only when self-forgiveness has been achieved can the perpetrator accept full responsibility for his/her actions and go on to seek forgiveness from his/her victim. Holmgren (1998) and North (1998) extend this belief by stating that while self-forgiveness must occur first, it actually cannot be completed until the perpetrator has made amends with, and received forgiveness from, the victim. Of course, a problem with such a definition is that the person whose victim is dead or refuses to forgive is denied the possibility of complete self-forgiveness.

There are many paths that a researcher could take to disentangle the occurrence of these two types of forgiveness-seeking. One explanation may be that the order in which these occur is dependent on personality and the severity of the transgression. For instance, Rourke-Marcheterre (2003) found that in low and moderate guilt/severity situations, extraverts were more likely to immediately seek forgiveness from their victim (interpersonal) while introverts were more likely to first turn inwards (intrapersonal). This difference disappeared in the more severe and higher guilt situations, with both extraverts and introverts first turning inwards. Given the conceptual distinction between interpersonal and intrapersonal forgiveness-seeking, in the creation of the measure for this thesis I developed items that assessed both aspects of the process. In addition, given the preliminary findings of Rourke-Marcheterre (2003) that these domains of concern may shift as a function of the severity of the transgression, the questionnaire included

situations that ranged from low to high severity.

Given the different ways in which forgiveness-seeking may be experienced, there are numerous specific dimensions of concern that a wrong-doer might be motivated to address. For instance, researchers have described many reasons for confessing and apologizing. These include the following: To exert damage control over others' impressions of oneself (Bennett & Dewberry, 1994; Darby & Schlenker, 1989; Estrada-Hollenbeck & Heatherton, 1998; Fukuno & Ohbuchi, 1998; Gold & Weiner, 2000; McCullough & Witvliet, 2002; Ohbuchi, Kameda, & Agarie, 1989; Schmitt, Gollwitzer, Förster, & Montada, 2004); to decrease the severity of the punishment (Darby & Schlenker, 1989; Hamilton & Hagiwara, 1992; Johnstone, 1999; McCullough & Witvliet, 2002; Regehr & Gutheil, 2002); to reduce one's own personal distress (Scobie & Scobie, 1998); to rid the self of feelings of guilt (Baumeister et al., 1998; Estrada-Hollenbeck, & Heatherton, 1998; Semin & Manstead, 1983; Scobie & Scobie, 2002; Steiner, 2000; Tangney, 1995; Worthington Jr. & Wade, 1999); to rid the self of feelings of shame (Estrada-Hollenbeck & Heatherton, 1998); to address religious reasons (Rhodes, Albright, & McMinn, 1995); to restore justice (Exline et al., 2003; Ohbuchi et al., 1989; Worthington Jr., 2000); to restore balance to the relationship and power to the victim (Fitness, 2001; Gold & Weiner, 2000; Goodwin & Ross, 1992; Hamilton & Hagiwara, 1992; Schneider, 2000; Taft, 2000; Worthington Jr., 2000); to increase the overall well-being of the victim (Regehr & Gutheil, 2002; Taft, 2000); and to restore trust and to promote reconciliation in the relationship (Estrada-Hollenbeck & Heatherton, 1998; Fincham, 2000; Fitness, 2001; Govier, 1998; Hodgins & Liebeskind, 2003; Scher &

Darley, 1997; Schlenker, 1980; Tangney, 1995; Thompson & Snyder, 2004; Todd, 1985; Tomlin, Dineen, & Lewicki, 2003; Worthington Jr. & Wade, 1999).

One of the most well-established reasons for making some form of reparative, forgiveness-seeking gesture is the feeling of guilt (Bonar, 1989; Govier & Verwoerd, 2002; Takada & Ohbuchi, 2004) which, in the German language, literally means “debt” (Baumeister et al., 1998). Guilt has been described as a universal feeling because at some point, everyone transgresses against another (Loewen, 1970). Guilt is a negative state of emotional distress (Baumeister, Stillwell, & Heatherton, 1994) that includes feeling tense, regretful, remorseful, and wishful for reparation (Caprara, Manzi, & Perugini, 1992; Eisenberg, 2000; Tangney, 1995). It is linked with the realization of having neglected to foresee the consequences of an action that violates personal moral standards, and for which one is responsible (Kubany & Watson, 2003). Benson (1992), in an interesting study, examined the effects of negative emotional states such as guilt, and found that approximately 75% of patients in the hospital with a physical illness actually had their illness rooted in emotional causes, which often included guilt (Benson, 1992). In addition to possibly contributing to the manifestation of physical illnesses, studies have also linked guilt to depression and anxiety (Caprara et al., 1992). Although guilt is a behaviour-focused emotion (rather than self-focused like shame) it can strike at a perpetrator’s self-esteem, self-image and self-confidence (Schwan, 1998).

Despite the negative repercussions that guilt can have on an individual, it is for the most part, an other-oriented concern that generally leaves the perpetrator’s core identity unharmed (Eisenberg, 2000; Konstam et al., 2001; Tangney, 1995). As such,

guilt often promotes empathy towards the victim (Einstein & Lanning, 1998; Tangney, 1995), causing the perpetrator to reflect on how his/her actions have affected the victim (Leith & Baumeister, 1998). This motivates an attempt to re-establish a relationship with the victim by engaging in some sort of reparative action (Baumeister, Stillwell, & Heatherton, 1995; Eisenberg, 2000; Estrada-Hollenbeck & Heatherton, 1998; Hall & Fincham, 2005; Steiner, 2000; Tangney, Wagner, Hill-Barlow, Marschall, & Gramzow, 1996). Such actions include apology and confession, both of which can be used as a means of repairing the damage inflicted by the transgression (Tangney, 1995).

Expressing guilt about a transgression is also a means for the wrong-doer to indicate to the victim that he/she will not engage in the same behaviour again. In one particular study, participants were asked to relay information about a time when they had transgressed and felt guilty, versus a time when they had transgressed but had not felt guilty. In the guilt narratives, participants were significantly more likely to indicate that they had made some sort of reparative gesture, such as restitution, apology or confession, and that they had learned a lesson and changed their behaviour (Baumeister et al., 1995). When seeking forgiveness, one always runs the risk of being declined the request, which may very well exacerbate the guilt; however, seeking forgiveness and having it granted, certainly helps to reduce guilt (Estrada-Hollenbeck & Heatherton, 1998) and may well be worth the risk. For those who feel guilty, forgiveness may be viewed as an opportunity to create a better self (Govier & Verwoerd, 2002).

Closely linked to the feeling of guilt is that of shame. In the aforementioned study by Witvliet et al. (2002), in which participants described how they had felt during a time

they had transgressed, 55% reported that they had felt shame. Interestingly, many lay people, and in the past, many researchers, have tended to use the terms shame and guilt interchangeably (as observed by Leith & Baumeister, 1998; Tangney, 1995). While both are moral, self-conscious emotions (Eisenberg, 2000; Konstam et al., 2001; Tangney et al., 2005); can arise from the same transgression (Tangney, 1995); and can co-occur in the same individual (Karp, 1998; Tangney et al., 1996), they actually motivate the perpetrator to engage in very different behaviours. Shame is a feeling of being publicly scrutinized and exposed and makes one feel inferior and degraded (Eisenberg, 2000), and threatens one's social status in the community (Karp, 1998). Unlike guilt, it is a preoccupation with the self and how the self is perceived by others and has been labeled as being more painful and devastating than guilt (Eisenberg, 2000). This may be because shame confronts individuals with an unacceptable image of themselves, rattling their core identity and leaving them feeling worthless, exposed and powerless, which often results in a desire to escape and disappear (Halling, 1994; Konstam et al., 2001; Tangney et al., 1996). Since shame is self-focused, there is often less empathy for the victim, and thus, less focus on the victim's welfare. Although being forgiven certainly reduces shame (Kubany & Watson, 2003), as a result of the lack of empathy and the feeling that the self is defective, shame often leads perpetrators to avoid taking responsibility for their actions (Tangney, 1995). Consequently, avoidance makes a perpetrator less likely to approach his/her victim to try to rectify the situation (Eisenberg, 2000). When perpetrators who feel shame try to make amends, their motives may be more about impression management than a concern for their victim's welfare (Estrada-Hollenbeck & Heatherton,

1998).

Given that guilt can elicit empathy, and that shame elicits a concern about the self, it may be that perpetrators engage in forgiveness-seeking because of empathy for their victim(s), or alternatively, because of self-interest (Batson, Klein, Highberger, & Shaw, 1995; Karremans & Van Lange, 2004; Sandage, Worthington Jr., Hight, & Berry, 2000; Takada & Ohbuchi, 2004). One motive, which is clearly linked to self-interest, is that of avoiding punishment (Caprara et al., 1992; Fukuno & Ohbuchi, 1998; Ohbuchi, Suzuki, & Takaku, 2003; Takaku, Weiner, & Ohbuchi, 2001). As was clearly demonstrated when exploring forgiveness-granting, victims are often motivated to seek revenge. As humans, we are fully aware that when a situation is unjust, victims have a need to punish the transgressor (Carlsmith, Darly, & Robinson, 2002; Hogan & Emler, 1981; Ohbuchi & Takada, 2001). In a study asking victims to recall a transgression against them, and how they reacted to it, participants generally stated that they had clearly expressed to the wrong-doer their anger and hostility, often with critical and nasty remarks (Leary & Springer, 1998). The goal of punishment is not only to reduce the harm, but also to decrease the chance of the re-occurrence of the same transgression (Carlsmith et al., 2002). In our Western culture, we seem to be more motivated to punish perpetrators than we are to compensate victims; no matter how great the suffering and the empathy for the victim, the anger towards the perpetrator tends to be greater (Hogan & Emler, 1981; Miller, 2001). For the perpetrator though, allowing the victim to exact revenge can result in emotional harm, physical harm, and social humiliation (Hogan & Emler, 1981; Karp, 1998.)

Seeking forgiveness is known to facilitate the granting of forgiveness (e.g., North, 1987; Schlenker, 1980), thus decreasing the severity of the punishment directed towards the wrong-doer, or possibly even doing away with it all together (Darby & Schlenker, 1989; North, 1998). Granting a perpetrator forgiveness not only decreases the punishment, but also lets the perpetrator know that he/she is viewed as a person of worth (Gassin, 1998), which may help to alleviate some of the negativity that he/she is feeling towards him/herself (Mills, 1995).

Beyond the desire to decrease negative emotions and avoid punishment after a transgression, a perpetrator may also be concerned with how others view him/her in light of the transgression (Anderson, Krull, & Weiner, 1996; Gold & Weiner, 2000; Kelley, 1998; Sandage & Wiens, 2001; Scobie & Scobie, 1998; Silverman, Rivera, & Tedeschi, 1979); this is known as impression management (Bolino & Turnley, 2003). In fact, a study conducted with American and Japanese students found that motives for apologizing, which can be a forgiveness-seeking behaviour, were alleviation of negative emotions, avoidance of punishment, and impression management. Together, these three motives accounted for 84% of the variance in apology motives (Itoi, Ohbuchi, & Fukuno, 1996). In further support of wrong-doers being motivated to positively influence others' perceptions of them, Miller and Tangney (1994) found that after a transgression, perpetrators reported that they had felt like bad people and had been quite worried that others would think poorly of them and would be disgusted with their behaviour. Perhaps the reason that perpetrators are motivated to have others view them positively after a transgression is because of our human need to belong. Realizing that others might view

them negatively, wrong-doers may feel anxious at the thought of being excluded from social groups (Baumeister & Tice, 1990; Carlsmith, in press). Experiencing a concern with impression management may thus motivate perpetrators to engage in reparative actions in an attempt to influence others' opinions of them (Bolino & Turnley, 2003; Ohbuchi et al., 2003).

Although the motives of shame and impression management seem to be directed towards the self, as previously mentioned, there also exist other-oriented motives of forgiveness-seeking. As discussed, after a transgression, a victim experiences many negative thoughts and emotions. In essence, for many victims, especially after a serious transgression, their beliefs about the world in terms of their self-worth, personal control, justice, goodness of others and God may be shattered (Flanigan, 1998). In accordance with this, and in line with feeling other-oriented empathy, it may be that the wrong-doer is motivated to seek forgiveness in order to make the victim feel better (Akhtar, 2002; Kelley, 1998; Sandage & Wiens, 2001; Scobie & Scobie, 1998). Helping the victim to feel better about himself/herself and the situation helps to increase the chances of being forgiven, and of restoring balance to the relationship (Hodgins et al., 1996).

One of the many reasons that a victim may feel hurt by a transgression is the lack of fairness or justice in the situation (Brandsma, 1982). After a transgression, a perpetrator often feels anxious because he/she has disrupted the equity of the relationship (Kelln & Ellard, 1999). Forgiveness is linked to the concept of justice, because to have something to forgive, something unjust must have occurred (Enright, Santos, & Al-Mabuk, 1989). Relationships are meant to be filled with equity, fairness, trust, and

loyalty, all of which are negatively affected in the aftermath of a transgression (Hargrave, 1994). Justice is about bringing the balance, fairness and equity back into the relationship by making restitution to the victim, and sometimes to society (Bazemore, 1998; Bradfield & Aquino, 1999). Therefore, a motive for seeking forgiveness may be to restore balance, power, and justice to the relationship (Ohbuchi et al., 1989; Sandage & Wiens, 2001; Schmitt, Gollwitzer, Maes, & Arbach, 2005; Worthington Jr., 2000).

Given that forgiveness can be examined from a theological perspective (Brandsma, 1982), another forgiveness-seeking motive that must be mentioned is a religious motive. Forgiveness can have a religious component to it, because it is about moral feelings of what is right and wrong (Bergin, 1980; North, 1998). In addition, research has shown that committing a transgression calls a person's moral character into question, and often, moral character is shaped by perceptions of God's desires (Gold & Weiner, 2000). The concept of forgiveness is in fact implicit in many religious teachings (Leach & Lark, 2004; McCullough & Witvliet, 2002; Schwan, 1998) and as a result, is also present in a wide array of cultural norms and values (Fincham & Beach, 2001). For instance, forgiveness has a place in Hinduism and Buddhism (Baures, 1996; Worthington Jr., Berry, & Parrott III, 2001), in Confucianism and Islam (Fincham & Kashdan, in press; Idler et al., 2003; Worthington Jr. et al., 2001), in Judaism, and in Christianity (Seybold, Hill, Neumann, & Chi, 2001). Reconciliation is also a concept with religious roots, as is demonstrated by religious emphases on reconciling one's relationship with God after the commission of a sin (Dwyer, 1999; Fow, 1996).

In Christianity, forgiveness-seeking is an important part of religious practice, with

an emphasis on feeling guilty, confessing, and reconciling (Holeman, 2003). Christianity puts the onus on confession and repentance as the path to healing relationships with other humans as well as with God (Hope, 1987; Pope, 2005; Witvliet, 2001). Therefore, it may be that perpetrators are motivated to seek forgiveness due to their religious beliefs and values.

Whatever the motivation to seek forgiveness, it is important to also examine the accompanying behaviours (Kelley, 1998). In terms of forgiveness-seeking, there are various behaviours for wrong-doers to choose from in order to address their concern(s). For example, in a study asking participants to recall a time when they had been a victim, and how their perpetrator had reacted, results revealed that 24% of the perpetrators apologized, 14% asked for forgiveness, and 50% either acted as if they did not care, or did nothing (Leary & Springer, 1998). Examining a group of men incarcerated for felonious assault, manslaughter or murder, researchers found that 18.7% provided an excuse (claims of an accident), 50% gave a justification, 17% denied, and 14% admitted to the crime but gave no explanation as to why they had committed it (Felson, & Ribner, 1981).

Two common ways that a wrong-doer can attempt to seek forgiveness from his/her victim are apology and confession. In the study by Witvliet et al. (2002), asking participants to imagine a time when they had previously hurt someone, 85% reported they had apologized to their victim. Confessing ideally means taking responsibility and rebuilding trust, and includes the facets of guilt, remorse and commitment to change (Holeman, 2004). Similarly, an apology can be a way for a perpetrator to demonstrate to

the victim that he/she is aware of the harm, and that he/she is taking responsibility for the cause of the transgression as well as its consequences (Barnlund & Yoshioka, 1990; Bennett & Dewberry, 1994; McCullough, Worthington Jr., & Rachal, 1997). In addition, apology can signify that the behaviour will not occur again (Baumeister et al., 1995; Darby & Schlenker, 1982; 1989; Schneider, 2000). Thus, an apology can imply that the person is remorseful and embarrassed about his/her behaviour, sympathizes with the victim, and is committed to behaving more responsibly in the future (Fincham, 2000; Goffman, 1971; Malcom & Waldorsky, 2005; McCullough & Witvliet, 2002; Ohbuchi et al., 1989; Schlenker, 1980). However, not all apologies will contain the same elements. In addition to an apology in which the wrong-doer takes full responsibility, there are for instance, apologies in which the wrong-doer makes excuses for why he/she behaved the way that he/she did. For instance, Belicki, Rourke-Marcheterre and McCarthy (2005) have reported that such excuse-making apologies can be as effective as sincere apologies in invoking forgiveness. One possibility for the success of such excuse-making apologies is that they represent an admission of regret and signify that the perpetrator believes in, and values, the relational norms that were broken by the transgression (Darby & Schlenker, 1982; 1989; Itoi et al., 1996; Scher & Darley, 1997). By reaffirming his/her belief in the rules that were broken, the perpetrator makes the statement that who he/she was while transgressing is not his/her true self.

Whatever the form of apology, research has found that confession and apology are helpful in decreasing the negative repercussions that accompany a transgression, and as well, in facilitating the granting of forgiveness (Fincham, 2000; Fow, 1996; Girard &

Mullet, 1997; Kelley, 1998; McCullough et al., 1998; McCullough et al., 1997; North, 1987; Schlenker, 1980; Worthington Jr., 1998). Consistent with these research findings that apologies can decrease negative repercussions and increase forgiveness, it has been found (in the U. S.) that malpractice suits are significantly less likely to be filed if the victim is offered an apology (Haley, 1998).

A further suggestion as to why confession and apology help to increase feelings of forgiveness is that both are forms of self-punishment, putting the wrong-doer in a vulnerable situation because the victim may refuse the apology and decide to exact revenge (Akhtar, 2002; Goffman, 1971; Schneider, 2000; Scher & Darley, 1997; Schlenker & Darby, 1981; Thompson & Snyder, 2004). In addition, it has been suggested that an apology may result in the victim developing empathy for the perpetrator. Empathy is known to facilitate forgiveness-granting and is thought to come about through reframing (Enright et al., 1992; McCullough, 2001; McCullough et al., 1998; McCullough et al., 1997; Takaku, 2001; Takaku et al., 2001). Reframing is a process that helps the victim to understand the state of mind of the perpetrator when he/she transgressed, and to see the transgression as acceptable (Enright, Rique, & Coyle, 2000; Goffman, 1971). Through empathy, an apology thus allows the victim to separate the perpetrator from the transgression (North, 1998). Being able to have an understanding of his/her actions helps the victim to develop empathy and grant forgiveness (Fow, 1996; Kelley, 1998; Ohbuchi & Takada, 2001; Worthington Jr., 1998). This may very well be another reason excuse-making apologies are effective. They may facilitate empathic understanding in the victim(s) (Belicki et al., 2005).

Confession and apology are, of course, not the only behaviours a perpetrator may make use of when seeking forgiveness. Other forgiveness-seeking behaviours include excuses and justifications. Both of these behaviours are aimed at decreasing responsibility for the transgression (Hamilton & Hagiwara, 1992; Takahashi & Ohbuchi, 1998). In using an excuse, the perpetrator acknowledges the harm but minimizes his/her responsibility by attributing the transgression to uncontrollable factors that could not be avoided (Fukuno & Ohbuchi, 1998; Gonzales, Perderson, Manning, & Wetter, 1990; Hodgins et al., 1996; Goffman, 1971; Takaku, 2000; Worthington Jr. & Wade, 1999). In using a justification, the perpetrator tries to minimize the harm by accepting responsibility for its occurrence, but claiming that for various reasons, the behaviour was legitimate (Fukuno & Ohbuchi, 1998; Hodgins et al., 1996). Motivations for offering an excuse or justification include to increase impression management (Bennett & Dewberry, 1994; Fukuno & Ohbuchi, 1998; Gonzales et al., 1990; Higgins, 2002; Itoi et al., 1996; Takahashi & Ohbuchi, 1998); to avoid punishment (Fukuno & Ohbuchi, 1998; Itoi et al., 1996); to make the self feel better and maintain self-worth (Kearns & Fincham, 2005); to reduce guilt (Kubany & Watson, 2003); to increase empathy towards the self (Takaku, 2000); to decrease the victim's negative emotions (Fukuno & Ohbuchi, 1998; Itoi et al., 1996; Takaku, 2000); and to restore and reconcile the relationship (Folkes & Whang, 2003).

There exist much other forgiveness-seeking motivated behaviours mentioned in the literature. For instance, a perpetrator can blame the victim (Fincham, 2000; Fincham & Beach, 2001; Karp, 1998; Mitchell, 1989; Rusbult et al., 2005); withdraw from the

situation (Barnlund & Yoshioka, 1990; Baumeister et al., 1998; Scobie & Scobie, 1998; Takaku, 2000); ask for forgiveness (Fincham, 2000; Fincham & Beach, 2001; Gonzales et al., 1994; Schlenker & Darby, 1981; Scobie & Scobie, 1998); give a direct apology, a non-verbal apology, do something nice for the victim, write a letter, or commit suicide (Barnlund & Yoshioka, 1990). In addition, the wrong-doer may also do whatever the victim asks of him/her to make up for the offense (Baumeister et al., 1998; Gonzales et al., 1994; Kelln & Ellard, 1999); make reparations (Estrada-Hollenbeck & Heatherton, 1998; Kubany & Watson, 2003; Rusbult et al., 2005; Schmitt et al., 2004; Schneider, 2000); pray to God (Schneider, 2000); apologize via a third party (Kelley, 1998); or forgive himself/herself (Kubany & Watson, 2003).

Building a Forgiveness-seeking Measure

The purpose of this study was to create a forgiveness-seeking questionnaire that assesses perpetrators' motivations for seeking forgiveness as well as the behaviours that they use to engage in, or to avoid, this process. Participants were asked to imagine themselves as the perpetrator in three hypothetical scenarios, one low, one moderate, and one high in severity.

The creation of the questionnaire stemmed from the following motivational forgiveness-seeking premise: Following the commitment of an offense in the context of a relationship, a perpetrator is motivated to reduce the damage that has taken place. That motivation can be thought of as being reflected in general domains of concern as well as in specific types of concern. In terms of domains, three are apparent from the literature: Self, Victim(s), and God. In other words, a perpetrator may be primarily concerned about

himself/herself, about the person(s) he/she has hurt, or about God. There also exist other potential domains. For instance, the perpetrator may be concerned about others who are not directly linked to the transgression but who may be affected by it. In fact, Worthington, vanOyen Witvliet, Lerner and Scherer (2005) stated that a transgression can have societal implications and affect others in addition to the victim(s) who was/were directly involved. In order to examine these possibilities, I included Others and Society as an additional domain. Finally, damage to relationships is an important consequence and it is unclear whether this should be thought of as a domain of concern in its own right, or rather, as a more specific type of concern falling under the domains of Self, Victim(s), Others and Society, and God. For instance, people who value relationships will be concerned about the impact of their actions on any relationships, including, for example, the relationship between a victim and his/her God. In the design of the questionnaire, the topic of "relationship" was thus considered as both a possible general domain of concern and a more specific type of concern.

Following the formulation of the five general domains of concern, the next step was to consider the specific types of concern that might arise within each domain, following the commission of an offense. An attempt was made to have the same specific types of concern across all five general domains, but this was not always possible. For instance, it made no sense to include self-image concern items in the God domain.

The following specific types of concern were incorporated into the questionnaire: Avoidance of punishment, concern about public image, emotional well-being, self-image, sense of fairness/justice, loss of relationship, loss or gain of power, and loss of ability to

trust. Items measuring avoidance of punishment dealt with concerns about the self being punished and the victim or others feeling vulnerable. Items measuring public image dealt with concerns about how others may now view the perpetrator; how others (including God) may now view the victim; how others view the perpetrator's group/society; and how others view God (for letting this happen). Items measuring emotional well-being dealt with concerns about ridding the self of bad and stressful feelings such as guilt; ridding the victim and others of negative feelings (e.g., anger, fear, sorrow and disappointment); and ridding God of any negative thoughts or feelings God may be having. Items measuring self-image dealt with concerns about restoring one's own damaged self-esteem as well as the victim's damaged self-esteem. Items measuring concerns about fairness or justice dealt with restoring to the self, the victim, others, and God a sense that fairness and justice prevail in the relationship and in the world. Items measuring loss of relationship dealt with concerns about a change or loss in relationship with the victim, others and God. Items measuring loss or gain of power dealt with concerns about the victim and God having too little or too much power, and the wrongdoer having too little or too much power in the relationship. Items measuring loss of ability to trust dealt with concerns about the victim, others, and God losing their trust in the perpetrator.

When the perpetrator is motivated to seek forgiveness, he/she must then engage in behaviours that demonstrate this desire to the victim(s), to others and society, and/or to God. Rourke-Marcheterre (2003) found personality differences reflected in participants' immediate behavioural impulse following an offense. However, if the olive branch of

forgiveness-seeking is not reciprocated with the granting of forgiveness, the wrong-doer may have to change tactics in order to move on with his/her life. To address this issue, all of the concern items, as well as the behavioural items were asked twice. Participants were asked what concern(s) they would immediately have, and what behaviour(s) they would engage in to address each concern; and what concern(s) they would need to address (and how they would do this) in order to eventually move on from the situation.

Forgiveness-seeking and Personality (HEXACO)

Given the range of forgiveness-seeking motives and behaviours that exist, one question that arises is what contributes to these differences. Part of the answer may lie in an examination of individual differences. Beginning in 1937 with Allport attempting to organize and understand human traits (Maher & Gottesman, 2005), much psychological research has focused on creating structural models of personality traits (Lee, Ogunfowora, & Ashton, 2005). Following the 1960's, when there was a flourish in attempts to create reliable and valid trait measures, there came a decade of trait critique in which the emphasis was on the role of situations in determining behaviour (Cervone & Shoda, 1999). The 1980's however, brought with it a new appreciation for the use of traits in psychological research, and as a result, Costa and McCrae created their Five-Factor model of personality which is still widely used today (Cervone & Shoda, 1999).

In applying trait theory to the study of forgiveness, many studies have demonstrated links between personality and forgiveness and forgiveness-related variables (see Mullet, Neto & Rivière, 2005, for a review of the Big Five personality traits and forgiveness). For instance, Emotional Stability, has been found to be positively correlated

with the disposition to forgive (e.g., Ashton, Paunonen, Helmes, & Jackson, 1998) as well as anxious guilt (fear of punishment) (Einstein & Lanning, 1998), and escape-avoidance coping techniques (Bolger, 1990; Byrd O'Brien, & DeLongis, 1996).

Likewise, compared to introverts, extraverts have been found to be less likely to rely on escape-avoidance coping techniques (Byrd O'Brien & DeLongis, 1996; Endler & Parker, 1990). Furthermore, Extraversion is negatively correlated with anxious guilt (Einstein & Lanning, 1998). Agreeableness has been related to placing high value on harmonious relationships (Byrd O'Brien & DeLongis, 1996; White, Hendrick, & Hendrick, 2004), and to being more forgiving (see Mullet et al., 2005). The Agreeableness trait has also been found to be positively correlated with receiving others' forgiveness (Walker & Gorsuch, 2002). Furthermore, the trait of Agreeableness is positively correlated with empathic guilt, which is described as having a need for reparation as well as insight into others' distress (Einstein & Lanning, 1998).

As most theorists acknowledge, there exists a complex interplay between personality and how an individual reacts to the situation encountered. Specifically, characteristics of the situation play an important role and the role they play might interact with personality. In terms of transgressions, the severity of the transgression, as well as the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim, are two of many factors that likely interact with the perpetrator's personality to determine how the perpetrator will react. As such, two individuals can encounter the same transgression and have very different reactions (Rourke-Marcheterre, 2003).

For the purposes of this thesis, the personality traits examined were derived from

the 6-factor HEXACO model of personality which is based on the following six factors: Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience (Ashton & Lee, 2006; Ashton, Lee, & Son, 2000). Although the more commonly utilized Big Five personality model represents the personality traits thought to be the most basic, the Five-trait solution has failed to be recovered in several languages. The Six-factor solution however, has been observed in at least twelve different languages including Hungarian, German, Dutch, Korean, and French (Ashton & Lee, 2006; Ashton et al., 2004). In addition, the 6-factor model has a more coherent theoretical basis, dividing the traits in terms of different areas of functioning and orientations. Specifically, Extraversion is linked to social functioning, Conscientiousness to task-related functioning, and Openness to Experience to idea-related functioning. The other three traits can be viewed in terms of an altruistic versus antagonistic orientation. Honesty-Humility and Agreeableness can be understood as having an orientation towards reciprocal altruism, while Emotionality can be understood in terms of an orientation towards kin altruism, which is a tendency to cooperate with others (Lee, & Ashton, 2006). By understanding the traits in terms of these areas of functioning and orientations, the 6-factor model lends itself to clearer theoretical interpretations of the data (Ashton & Lee, 2001). Given the nature of forgiveness, the ability to interpret differing styles of altruism (kin vs. reciprocal), as well as antagonism makes the use of the 6-factor model particularly appealing. Furthermore, although differentially organized, the 6-factor solution contains all of the elements of the Big-Five model and as well, a new, separate factor termed Honesty-Humility. This sixth factor is of particular interest to the study of

forgiveness and forgiveness-seeking.

Individuals who rate high on the Honesty-Humility trait tend to be characterized as loyal, sincere, trustworthy, just, and fair (Ashton & Lee, 2001; 2006; Ashton et al., 2004; Ashton et al., 2000; Lee & Ashton, 2004). This trait is thus a measure of an individual's tendency to not exploit others. While the honesty adjectives do have modest loadings on the Big Five model, they are unique enough to make up their own, individual factor (Ashton et al., 2000). Given the link between Narcissism and unforgiveness (Exline et al., 2004), it is interesting to note that Lee and Ashton (2005) have found that high scores on the Honesty-Humility factor tend to be associated with lower scores on Narcissism. Thus it seems likely that an individual high in Honesty-Humility will be likely to engage in forgiveness-seeking behaviours such as apologizing.

The trait of Emotionality is most often characterized by empathy, harm-avoidance, and taps into anxiety and sentimentality in contrast to toughness and bravery. This trait is different from the Emotional Stability trait found in the Big Five model as it lacks the content related to anger (Lee & Ashton, 2006).

Individuals scoring high on the Extraversion personality trait tend to be sociable, talkative, lively, warm, support seeking, and positive in affect (Ashton & Lee, 2006; Ashton et al., 2004; Jackson, Ashton, & Tomes, 1996; White, Hendrick, & Hendrick, 2004). The trait of Extraversion has also been found to be negatively correlated to the trait of Narcissism (Watson & Clark, 1992). From this, together with the aforementioned findings of Rourke-Marcheterre (2003), it seems likely that extraverts will also engage in forgiveness-seeking behaviours such as apology.

Those who score high on the Agreeableness trait tend to be compliant, altruistic, tolerant, peaceful, modest, even-tempered, and place high value on harmonious relationships (Ashton & Lee, 2006; Ashton et al., 2004; Byrd O'Brien & DeLongis, 1996; Jackson, Ashton, & Tomes, 1996; White et al., 2004). There is a difference in this Agreeableness trait versus the one in the Big Five Model. In the HEXACO model, the adjective of even-tempered (versus anger) is related to Agreeableness, whereas in the Big Five Model, it is related to Emotional Stability (Lee & Ashton, 2006).

Those who score high on the Conscientiousness trait are described as being diligent, organized, achievement-oriented, and competent (Ashton & Lee, 2006; Ashton et al., 2004; White et al., 2004). Individuals high on the trait of Openness to Experience (Intellect/Imagination) tend to be curious, creative, intellectual and unconventional (Ashton & Lee, 2006; Ashton et al., 2004).

Summary

The purpose of my Master's thesis is, as a first step in the development of a theory of forgiveness-seeking, to develop a questionnaire that assesses both forgiveness-seeking motives and behaviours. This questionnaire will be based on the premise that following the commission of an offense in the context of a relationship, a perpetrator will be motivated to reduce the damage that has taken place. Items will be derived from the literature on motives and behaviours. Depending on the individual, I am proposing that this damage may have an effect in five general areas or domains: God, self, victim, others and society, and relationships. Within each of these domains I propose that there will be specific types of concerns: Avoidance of punishment, public image, emotional well-

being, self-image, sense of fairness/justice, loss of relationship, loss or gain of power, and loss of ability to trust.

The main goal of this study is to attempt to derive subscales for the proposed domains of concern that are internally consistent and reliable over time. The validity of the derived subscales will be explored by correlations and also with a measure of social desirability. In addition, the validity of some of the subscales will be explored with a measure of the Six-factor model of personality traits. This will be done by attempting to replicate my prior findings that in low and moderate severity situations extraverts first engage in forgiveness-seeking behaviours that involve approaching (versus avoiding) the victim, but that in high severity situations, extraverts, like introverts first engage in avoidance behaviours (Rourke-Marcheterre, 2003).

METHOD

Study 1 (Pilot Study)

Participants

Participants ($N = 54$) were students (38 women, 12 men, 4 undeclared) in Psychology courses at Brock University. They were recruited through advertisements in lectures, and received course credit (1 hour) as compensation. Participants ranged in age from 19 to 31 years ($M = 21.28$, $SD = 2.66$); four participants failed to declare their age.

Materials

Demographics

Demographic information was obtained using a two-item questionnaire which asked participants for their sex and age.

Offender Scenarios

The first step in the creation of the forgiveness-seeking questionnaire was to develop three scenarios depicting a transgression that was low, moderate, or high in severity in terms of its consequences to the victim. In order to select the three best suited scenarios, a total of 11 scenarios were tested (see Appendix A). In each scenario, characters were gender-neutral, and the relationship of the victim to the perpetrator varied very little, ranging from best friend/partner to a good friend of the family. Seven of the scenarios had been used in a study by Rourke-Marcheterre (2003). Post-hoc findings of Rourke-Marcheterre (2003) indicated that three of these scenarios represented high severity situations, three represented moderate severity situations, and one represented a low severity situation. In order to provide more options at each level of severity, an additional five low severity situations were developed.

The three scenarios representing high severity situations were as follows: One scenario (Cheating) consisted of the individual cheating on his/her partner. Another (Drunk Driving) was a scenario, in which the individual chose to drive after drinking, resulting in the paralysis of his/her best friend. A third scenario (Babysitting) consisted of the individual neglecting his/her babysitting duties while looking after the toddler of a good friend of the family, resulting in the severe injury of the child. The idea for this particular scenario stemmed from one used by Berry, Worthington Jr., Parrott III, O'Connor and Wade (2001) in which a child drank cleaning fluid while his/her babysitter slept in front of the television.

The three scenarios representing moderate severity situations were as follows: One (Workplace Gossip) consisted of the individual gossiping about his/her best friend to co-workers, resulting in the friend losing his/her new promotion. The idea for this particular scenario stemmed from one used by Girard and Mullet (1997) which was about sisters working in the same firm. One of the sisters disclosed information about her sibling who had asked for a promotion. The information disclosed resulted in the denial of the other sibling's request for promotion. A second scenario (Movie) consisted of the individual lying to his/her best friend in order to go on a date, and getting caught. Yet another (Tell Secret) consisted of the individual betraying the confidence of his/her best friend, resulting in the termination of the best friend's romantic relationship.

The low severity scenarios were as follows: One (Late Lunch) consisted of the individual failing to show up for lunch with a friend. Another (Embarrassment) consisted of the individual humiliating his/her best friend by disclosing an embarrassing story at a

dinner party. The idea for this scenario stemmed from a scenario found in the Forgiveness Likelihood Scale (Rye et al., 2001) in which a family member humiliated a relative by telling a story about him/her. An additional (Stolen Lunch) scenario consisted of the individual stealing a co-worker's lunch. A fourth (Library) consisted of an individual returning a friend's library book past the due date and neglecting to pay the late charge. Finally, one (Snap at Friend) consisted of the individual snapping at a friend for no good reason.

Following each scenario was a series of Likert scale items (see Appendix B for pilot study questionnaire) ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very). Using the Likert scale, participants were asked to rate how well they were able to imagine themselves in the scenario, and how realistic they found it. In addition, a series of four questions (see Appendix B) asked participants to rate how they would feel (guilty, ashamed, awful, and responsible) if they were actually in the situation described in the scenario. In addition, after reading all of the scenarios, participants were asked to rank them from 1 (least severe) to 11 (most severe).

Procedure

Interested participants came to the office of the researcher and picked up an envelope containing a consent form (see Appendix C), the questionnaire booklet, and a debriefing letter (see Appendix D). The researcher told participants that they would be reading 11 scenarios in which they would be asked to imagine themselves as a perpetrator. They were told to read and sign the consent form, fill out the package, and then read the debriefing letter. Participants took the booklet home to complete and either

returned their completed booklet to an essay drop-box in the Psychology Department (booklets and signed consent forms were dropped off in separate envelopes) or, they arranged a meeting time with the researcher to return the completed questionnaire booklet and to obtain their course credit.

Results and Discussion

Examination of the data revealed that four participants misunderstood the instructions for ranking the scenarios in order of severity. Instead of ranking the scenarios with 1 as the lowest level of severity and 11 as the highest level of severity, it appears that these participants reversed the instructions and ranked the scenarios with 1 as the highest severity and 11 as the lowest severity. This conclusion was reached by examining the participants' ratings of guilt, shame and awfulness. Two faculty members of the Brock University Psychology Department were consulted and agreed that these four participants had misunderstood the instructions. In accordance with this conclusion, before conducting analyses, these four participants' rank scores were reversed.

Descriptive statistics were obtained for each of the questions. Means and standard deviations for each scenario in terms of rank and how guilty, awful, ashamed, and responsible participants would feel can be found in Table 1. Also in Table 1 are the means and standard deviations for how well participants were able to imagine themselves in each scenario, as well as how realistic they found each scenario.

The Drunk Driving scenario was ranked as the most severe scenario ($M = 10.33$, $SD = 1.72$) and also elicited the highest level of guilt ($M = 4.98$, $SD = .14$). In terms of awfulness, shame and responsibility, it was either rated the highest or second highest.

Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations for all Scenarios, Arranged in Order of Mean Severity Ranking

Scenario	Rank M (SD)	Guilt M (SD)	Awful M (SD)	Ashamed M (SD)	Respons- ible M (SD)	Imagine M (SD)	Realistic M (SD)
Drunk Driving	10.33 (1.72)	4.98 (.14)	4.96 (.19)	4.78 (.65)	4.86 (.64)	2.62 (1.19)	4.14 (1.43)
Babysitting	9.92 (1.57)	4.94 (.31)	4.96 (.19)	4.82 (.66)	4.80 (.67)	2.60 (1.32)	3.72 (1.07)
Cheating	8.36 (1.29)	4.76 (.66)	4.70 (.68)	4.70 (.65)	4.30 (1.03)	2.74 (1.39)	4.12 (1.34)
Workplace Gossip	7.05 (1.58)	4.20 (.86)	4.14 (.88)	4.10 (.99)	4.12 (1.02)	2.84 (1.84)	3.32 (1.17)
Tell Secret	6.94 (1.72)	4.12 (1.08)	3.94 (1.11)	3.74 (1.24)	3.88 (1.17)	3.18 (1.14)	4.30 (.89)
Embarrass- ment	5.17 (1.66)	4.04 (.86)	3.88 (.94)	3.80 (1.03)	4.08 (.80)	3.24 (1.20)	3.78 (1.04)
Movie	5.03 (1.81)	4.32 (.84)	4.22 (.82)	4.10 (1.09)	4.06 (1.24)	2.86 (1.43)	3.66 (1.27)
Snap at Friend	4.29 (2.04)	3.56 (1.11)	3.60 (1.21)	3.28 (1.11)	3.38 (1.19)	3.46 (1.34)	3.96 (1.15)
Stolen Lunch	3.72 (1.91)	4.16 (.89)	3.92 (.99)	4.06 (1.04)	6.31 (.98)	2.62 (1.28)	3.48 (1.15)
Late Lunch	2.47 (1.89)	3.48 (.86)	3.28 (1.03)	3.04 (1.05)	3.72 (1.03)	3.62 (1.14)	4.14 (.88)
Library	2.33 (1.97)	3.70 (1.01)	3.32 (1.08)	3.28 (1.18)	4.20 (1.03)	3.36 (1.14)	3.94 (.99)

N = 54

Although it ranked low on participants' ability to imagine themselves in the situation, this result was expected, as it was thought that no one would like to imagine themselves in this particular situation. In addition, the scenario was ranked fairly high in terms of realism. Based on this information and the fact that both students and an older community sample would be able to relate to it, this particular scenario was chosen to serve as the high severity scenario in Study 2.

For the moderate severity scenario to be used in Study 2, the Workplace Gossip scenario seemed to be the best choice. This particular scenario fell into the middle of the severity rankings ($M = 7.05$, $SD = 1.58$), and elicited only moderate amounts of guilt, shame and responsibility. Furthermore, it was thought that both students and an older community sample would be able to relate to this particular scenario.

The Library scenario and the Late Lunch scenario elicited the lowest ratings of guilt, shame and feelings of responsibility. Although the Late Lunch scenario was ranked as slightly more severe than the Library scenario ($M = 2.47$, $SD = 1.89$), it was retained as the low severity scenario for Study 2 because it was thought that an older community sample would be better able to relate to it than to the Library scenario.

STUDY 2

Method

Participants

Participants ($N = 221$) were 20 students at Brock University and 201 from the community. They ranged in age from 18 to 85 years ($M = 42.51$, $SD = 16.34$). One hundred and fifty of these participants were women ($M_{age} = 40.51$, $SD = 15.94$) and 71

were men ($M_{age} = 46.72$, $SD = 16.52$). Occupations for participants varied, with student, retired, and teacher accounting for 52.6% of the occupations mentioned. Twenty-two participants failed to declare an occupation (see Table 2 for complete list of occupations). In terms of religious orientation, most participants identified themselves as being affiliated with some form of Christianity ($n = 142$). Twenty participants failed to declare a religious orientation (see Table 3 for complete list of religious affiliations).

Student participants from Brock University were recruited through posters, advertisements in lectures, and the SONA website. As a form of compensation, students had the choice of receiving course credit (1.5 hours for the first session and 1 hour for second session) or a \$2.00 Tim Horton's certificate (per session). Participants from the community were recruited through e-mail as well as by word of mouth. Participants from the community had the choice of receiving a \$2.00 Tim Horton's certificate (per session) as compensation, or no compensation. A total of 487 individuals from the community requested a questionnaire. The majority who did not return a completed booklet gave no explanation. For those who did, the most common reason cited was lack of time or being too busy. One participant said she could not complete the package because she was completely unable to imagine herself in the hypothetical scenarios. Another participant, who described himself as a very sensitive individual, and who read the Drunk Diving scenario first, found the scenario too upsetting to continue with the remainder of the booklet.

Participants were asked to complete a retest package three weeks after completing their first booklet. Of the 221 participants, 123 returned the second booklet. The majority

Table 2
Participant Occupations

Occupation	N	Occupation	N
Student	66	Career Counsellor	1
Retired	28	Consultant	1
Teacher	22	Daycare worker	1
Engineer	10	Dietician	1
Manager	7	Esthetician	1
Sales	6	Game designer	1
Banker	5	Hairdresser	1
Homemaker	5	Insurance	1
Finance	4	Journalist	1
Secretary	4	Kinesitherapist	1
Computer technician	3	Marketing director	1
Self-employed	3	Paralegal	1
Artist	2	Physiotherapist	1
Business	2	Programmer	1
Lawyer	2	Psychotherapist	1
Project coordinator	2	Radiology technician	1
Research assistant	2	Registered nurse	1
Social worker	2	Rigger	1
Support worker	2	Shipwright	1
Administrative assistant	1	Travel	1
Antique dealer	1		

Table 3
Religious Affiliation of Participants

Religion	N	Religion	N
Catholic	62	Islam	1
Christian	37	Muslim	1
Protestant	24	Buddhism	2
Anglican	15	Wiccan	2
Unitarian	4	Pagan	1
Jewish	3	None	30
Baptist	1	Agnostic	7
Lutheran	1	Atheist	4
Mennonite	1	Spiritual	3
Presbyterian	1	Missing	20
Quaker	1		

of participants who did not return a completed booklet gave no explanation. For those who did, the most common reason cited was again lack of time or being too busy. Although participants were asked to complete the second questionnaire booklet 21 days after the completion of the first booklet, the re-test interval ranged from 4 (1 person) to 76 (1 person) days ($M = 22.03$ days, $SD = 10.01$).

Participants ($n = 123$) who completed the re-test questionnaire booklet ranged in age from 18 to 85 years ($M = 44.96$, $SD = 16.32$). Eighty-four were women ($M_{age} = 43.43$ years, $SD = 16.29$) and 39 were men ($M_{age} = 48.26$ years, $SD = 16.11$). In terms of gender, participants who completed both sessions did not significantly differ from those who did not $t(219) = .149$, $p = .882$. There was however, a significant difference between the two in terms of age, with those that completed both sessions being significantly older ($M = 44.96$, $SD = 16.32$) than those who did not ($M = 39.43$, $SD = 15.93$), $t(219) = 2.53$, $p = .012$.

Materials

Demographics

Demographic information was obtained from each participant (see Appendix E). Information obtained included age, sex, discipline of studies (student sample only), occupation (community sample only), and religious orientation. As a means of providing an ID number to match Session 1 booklets to Session 2 booklets, participants were either asked for the last four digits of their student number (student sample) or for their birth date (community sample).

Personality (HEXACO)

The only questionnaire that tests for the six personality factors of Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience is Lee and Ashton's (2004) HEXACO Personality Inventory. The short version of this scale, which was used in this study, consists of 104 questions rated on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Lee and Ashton (2004) report that the HEXACO scale has a high level of internal consistency with reliabilities ranging from .89 (Conscientiousness) to .92 (Honesty-Humility). In addition, low correlations between the six factor scales suggest that these scales are relatively independent of each other.

Social Desirability (BIDR)

Participants also completed Paulhus' (1988) social desirability scale, *The Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding* (BIDR) Version Six (see Appendix F). This questionnaire has two subscales: Self-deceptive enhancement (SDE), which assesses the degree to which individuals respond to items with biased (positive) self-descriptions, and impression management (IM), which assesses the degree to which individuals respond to items in a manner that influences others to view them in a positive light. Each subscale consists of 20 items (for a total of 40 items) on which participants rate themselves using a scale from 1 (not true) to 7 (very true). Moderate co-efficient alphas are generally observed with the use of this scale. They typically range between .67-.77 for the self-deceptive enhancement subscale and between .77-.85 for the impression management subscale (Paulhus, 1988).

Forgiveness-Seeking Questionnaire

The purpose of this study was to create a forgiveness-seeking questionnaire that assesses perpetrators' motivations for seeking forgiveness as well as the behaviours that they use to engage in, or avoid, this process. Participants were asked to imagine themselves as the perpetrator in three hypothetical scenarios (from Study 1), one low, one moderate, and one high in severity.

Based on the literature reviewed, 87 items were designed to assess a wide range of possible motives for seeking forgiveness. Participants rated all of the items after each scenario. The items were organized first, by general domain of concern: God, self, victim, others and society, and relationship. Within each of these broad domains of concern, items were grouped into specific types of concern (as aforementioned, although an attempt was made to have the same specific types of concern in each broad domain, it did not always make sense to do so): Avoidance of punishment, public image, emotional well-being, self-image, sense of fairness/justice, loss of relationship, loss or gain of power, and loss of ability to trust. See Table 4 for a complete list of items categorized by general domain of concern and specific type of concern. Following each scenario, participants were asked to rate items twice. Specifically, they were given the following instructions; "Please rate on the following scales how concerned you would be about each item. We would first like you to rate which items you would be IMMEDIATELY concerned about RIGHT AFTER the situation occurs. Next we would like you to rate which items you would be concerned about LATER ON; things that you would eventually need to address in order TO MOVE ON from the situation.

Table 4

Forgiveness-seeking Items by General Domain and Specific Area of Concern

Domain	Type of Concern	Item
God	Public image	My losing faith in God
		The person(s) hurt losing faith in God
		Others losing faith in God
	Emotional well-being	God feeling bitter
		God feeling badly
		God feeling angry
Self	Loss of ability to trust	How God may be feeling badly because God can no longer trust me
	Loss of relationship	My being less likely to turn to God in times of need
		The person(s) I hurt being less likely to turn to God in times of need
		Others being less likely to turn to God in times of need
	Loss of power	God seeing my actions as disregarding God's values
	Sense of fairness/justice	God seeing my actions as breaking God's law
	Avoidance of Punishment	Avoiding punishment or retribution
		God not helping me when I need it
		The person(s) I hurt not helping me when I need it
		Others not helping me when I need it
		The person I hurt being angry
		God being angry
		Others being angry

Table 4 Continued

Forgiveness-seeking Items by General Domain and Specific Area of Concern

Domain	Type of Concern	Item
	Public image	Being viewed badly by the person(s) I hurt Being viewed badly by others Being viewed badly by God
	Emotional well-being	Dealing with the shock of what I have done Feeling better about myself Coming to terms with how badly I feel Alleviating some of the guilt or shame I feel The person(s) hurt forgiving me God forgiving me Others forgiving me
	Loss of ability to trust	How the person(s) I hurt may be feeling badly because they can no longer trust me The person(s) I hurt feeling that they must forgive me, even if they don't want to The person(s) I hurt being intimidated by me
	Self-image	Restoring my self-esteem Restoring my sense of being a good/decent person Coming to an understanding of what I did and why Forgiving myself
	Sense of fairness/justice	Making things right Restoring justice Doing what is fair
	Loss/Gain of Power	The person(s) I hurt having too much power over me

Table 4 Continued

Forgiveness-seeking Items by General Domain and Specific Area of Concern

Domain	Type of Concern	Item
Victim	Avoidance of Punishment	Others having too much power over me
		God having too much power over me
		The person(s) I hurt having no respect for me
		God having no respect for me
		Others having no respect for me
	Public image	The person(s) I hurt being afraid that I will hurt them again in the future
		The person(s) I hurt feeling vulnerable
		God blaming the person(s) I hurt
		Others blaming the person(s) I hurt
		God thinking less of the person(s) I hurt
Emotional well-being	Emotional well-being	Others thinking less of the person(s) I hurt
		The person(s) I hurt thinking that I blame them at least partially for what happened
		The person(s) I hurt being afraid to trust people
		The person(s) I hurt feeling bitter
		The person(s) I hurt feeling badly
	Self-image	The person(s) I hurt suffering from shock
		The person(s) I hurt blaming himself/herself
		The person(s) I hurt being disappointed with himself/herself
		The person(s) I hurt losing his/her self-esteem

Table 4 Continued

Forgiveness-seeking Items by General Domain and Specific Area of Concern

Domain	Type of Concern	Item
	Sense of fairness/justice	The person(s) I hurt no longer believing the world is a just/fair place
Others/Society	Avoidance of Punishment	Others feeling vulnerable because my actions undermined society's values/norms
		Others being afraid that I could hurt someone else in the future
		Society being afraid others will do as I did
		My society looking badly to other societies because of what I've done
	Emotional well-being	Others being afraid to trust people
		Others feeling bitter
		Others feeling badly
		Others suffering from shock
	Loss of ability to trust	How others may be feeling badly because they can no longer trust me
		Others I hurt feeling that they must forgive me, even if they don't want to
		Others being intimidated by me
	Self-image	Society blaming itself
Sense of fairness/justice		Others no longer believing the world is a just or fair place
		Others feeling betrayed because society's norms and values were disregarded

Table 4 Continued

Forgiveness-seeking Items by General Domain and Specific Area of Concern

Domain	Type of Concern	Item
Relationship	Loss of relationship	Losing my relationship with the person(s) I hurt
		Losing my relationship with God
		Losing my relationship with others
		Keeping the relationship going even if it's terrible
		My relationship with person(s) I hurt not being as good as it used to be
		My relationship with God not being as good as it used to be
		My relationships with others not being as good as they used to be
		How the person(s) I hurt could be affected if our relationship ends
		How God may be affected if my relationship with God ends
		How others may be affected if my relationships with them end
		How the person(s) I hurt may be affected if our relationship changes
		How God may be affected if my relationship with God changes
		How others may be affected if my relationships with them change

In addition to rating items relating to concerns after transgressing, participants were asked to rate their likelihood of using each of a broad range of forgiveness-seeking behaviours (31 items). These behaviours were generated to cover two possible domains: Approach (19 items) and avoidance behaviours (12 items). See Table 5 for a complete list of behaviour items categorized by domain. The order in which the behaviour items were presented was determined by a set of random numbers generated from an on-line computer program. After rating the behaviour items, participants were also asked to rate on a scale of 0 (not at all) to 6 (extremely true) how much they would need to receive forgiveness from their victims, society, God and themselves before they could move on from the situation. Furthermore, they were asked to rank from 1 (most important) to 4 (least important) the importance of receiving forgiveness from their victims, society, God and themselves in terms of being able to move on from the situation. See Appendix G for an example of the formatted questionnaire (using the Drunk Driving scenario).

Comments questionnaire. Following the completion of the entire booklet, participants were asked about the questionnaire and their experience of filling it out (see Appendix H).

Procedure

Student participants from Brock University completed the package in a small room, either individually or in groups of 2-4. I began the session by reading a verbal script (see Appendix I) explaining the purpose of the study. I then read through the consent form (see Appendix J). Participants signed the consent form and were given their questionnaire booklet. Following the completion of the booklet, participants were given a debriefing letter (see Appendix K) and the date of their second (re-test) session was

Table 5
Forgiveness-seeking Behaviours by Domain

Domain	Item
Approach	I would call the person(s) I hurt
	I would write to the person(s) I hurt
	I would go see the person(s) I hurt
	I would apologize for the hurt I've caused
	I would ask for forgiveness
	I would explain my actions, but make sure the person(s) hurt knew I was in the wrong
	I would try and justify my actions
	I would take full responsibility for what happened
	I would ask for understanding
	I would prove myself over and over again to the person(s) I had hurt
	I would do whatever the person(s) I hurt asked of me, to try to fix the situation
	I would do whatever it took, for however long it took, to make things better
	I would let the person(s) I hurt know that I understand that I hurt them
	I would blame someone else
	I would blame the person(s) I hurt
	I would go to the person(s) I hurt and explain my actions so that he/she could know it was not his/her fault
	I would seek out the person(s) I hurt, to talk things over
	I would seek the advice or opinion of a friend or family member about how I could fix the situation
	I would give the person(s) I hurt gifts to make up for what I did
Avoidance	I would take some time to collect my thoughts and reflect on what I've done
	I would go off on my own to calm myself down
	I would work on forgiving myself
	I would come to terms with what I'd done
	I would pray to God
	I would avoid the person(s) I hurt
	I would try to hide what I had done
	I would take some time to nurse myself and do something nice for myself
	I would take time to myself to work through my negative emotions
	I would have someone else go talk to the person(s) I hurt on my behalf
	I would give the person(s) I hurt some space
	I would do something fun to take my mind off of the situation

confirmed. Session 2 was run in an identical format.

For the community participants, materials were either sent by mail, or given to them in person. Participants first read an information letter (see Appendix L), and then the consent form. The only difference between the community and student consent forms was that the community sample was not given the option of obtaining research participation, and instead, was given the option of receiving no compensation. Included with the consent form was the Tim Horton's gift certificates (if so desired), and the Session 1 questionnaire booklet. After this booklet was a debriefing letter, the consent form for Session 2 (see Appendix M), the questionnaire booklet for Session 2, and the debriefing letter for Session 2 (see Appendix N). Although participants had access to all information about both sessions, the information letter provided to them asked them to follow a checklist. First, participants were asked to read and sign the consent form for Session 1. Then they were asked to fill out the package for Session 1 and following this, to read the debriefing letter for Session 1. Participants were then instructed to mark on their calendar the date, three weeks later, when they would need to fill out Session 2. Following this was a checklist section labeled *Session 2*. It had the same instructions as the aforementioned checklist, except they pertained to the Session 2 materials. Participants were also provided with a self-addressed and stamped envelope for the return of their booklets. They were given a separate envelope for their consent forms.

The formatting of the questionnaire booklets was identical for both the student and community samples, as well as for Sessions 1 and 2. The only difference between the booklets for the two sessions was that the HEXACO questionnaire and BIDR

questionnaire were only included in Session 1. To control for order effects, scenario orders as well as the order of the HEXACO and BIDR questionnaires were varied. This resulted in 12 different orders of booklets. Half of them had the HEXACO and BIDR before the scenarios while the other half had them after the scenarios.

Data Analyses

The purpose of the data analyses was first, to reduce the number of questionnaire items to a more reasonable and manageable number. The second purpose was to determine whether specific scores reflecting domains of concern (self, relationship, victim, others/society, God), specific types of concern (avoidance of punishment, public image, emotional well-being, self-image, sense of fairness/justice, loss of relationship, loss or gain of power, loss of ability to trust), and types of behaviours (approach and avoidance) could be derived. To this end, numerous exploratory factor analyses were conducted. Specifically, principal axis factoring with promax rotation was used. Items that loaded onto interpretable factors were then further examined by analyses of internal consistency (inter-item correlations and calculations of Cronbach's alpha).

Correlation coefficients were calculated to assess the relationship between the forgiveness-seeking measure and the two social desirability subscales. In some cases, correlations between the forgiveness-seeking items and these subscales represented construct validity. For example, the public image subscale was expected to correlate with the BIDR subscale of impression management. In most instances though, these correlations assessed divergent validity, specifically, freedom from response bias in the direction of socially desirable responses.

To further explore the validity of some of the subscales (approach and avoidance), correlation coefficients were calculated to assess the relationship between the forgiveness-seeking measure and the HEXACO measure.

Results

Data Verification

The data for each questionnaire booklet were entered into the SPSS program. Each entry was double-checked, and, in addition, when all the data had been entered, 30% of the questionnaire booklets were randomly selected and checked against the data in SPSS. Following this, frequency distributions for each variable were examined. This was done to ensure that the full range of scale items for each variable had been used.

From the frequency distributions, it was clear that there was quite a bit of missing data. Booklets (from Session 1 as well as Session 2) containing missing data were examined for patterns. It was discovered that eight participants (7 in Session 1, and one in Session 2) left questions blank instead of circling zero if an item was not applicable. This conclusion was reached by observing that these participants did not circle zero for any of the items in their booklets. Two faculty members at Brock University were consulted and agreed that for these participants, a zero (representing *not applicable*) could be substituted for missing data.

Another missing data pattern that emerged was that some participants answered the questionnaire by choosing whether an item would be of immediate concern or of long-term concern. In other words, if one of these participants circled that an item was of immediate concern to him/her, the long-term time frame for that same item was left blank, and vice-versa. It is not clear whether these participants misunderstood the instructions, or if they left time frames blank because if an item was of immediate concern to them, it was not also of long-term concern (and vice-versa). As such, the missing data for these participants was left as missing. In addition, other participants

seemed to randomly skip entire blocks of items, sometimes for both the immediate and long-term time frames, and sometimes for just one of them. No pattern between these skipped sections could be discerned, and it is possible, given the length of the questionnaire, that these sections were missed due to fatigue. In addition, while entering the data, it was discovered that four (three from Session 1, and one from Session 2) of the questionnaire booklets were missing a page and, as a result, all of those items had to be entered into SPSS as missing data. Furthermore, one of the re-test booklets was missing the lunch scenario and all corresponding questions.

Following the change of missing data to values of zeros for the eight participants mentioned above, frequency distributions were once again examined to assess the amount of missing data. Any item that had more than 5% missing data in either of the immediate or long-term time frames and across all three scenarios, was deleted and not included in further analyses. Nineteen motivation items were deleted on this basis. Any item that was deleted from the immediate time frame was also deleted from the long-term time frame and vice-versa. Table 6 lists the motivation items that were deleted.

Analyses for Motivation Items

The probabilities for all of the tests performed and reported in the Results section are two-tailed.

Preliminary Factor Analyses

All psychometric analyses were performed on the data from Session 1. The data from Session 2 were used for the test re-test analyses only. The ultimate goal of these factor analyses was to reduce the number of items in the questionnaire. Prior to

Table 6
Motivation Items Deleted from Analyses due to Missing Data

Item
Others not helping me when I need it
The person(s) I hurt being angry
Being viewed badly by the person(s) I hurt
Feeling better about myself
Restoring my self-esteem
The person(s) I hurt having too much power over me
God having too much power over me
Others having no respect for me
How God may be affected if my relationship with God ends
How others may be affected if my relationships with them end
How others may be affected if my relationships with them change
Others I hurt feeling they must forgive me, even if they don't want to
God blaming the person(s) I hurt
Others thinking less of the person(s) I hurt
Society being afraid that others will do as I did
My society looking badly to other societies because of what I've done
Others no longer believing the world is a just or fair place
Others feeling betrayed because society's norms and values were disregarded
Others losing faith in God

performing factor analyses, correlation coefficients were calculated between the immediate and long-term time frames, for each item, in order to determine if they were highly correlated. If they had been, an argument could have been made to analyze only one of the time frames and to replace missing data in that time frame with participants' scores from the other time frame. Correlation analyses showed a full range of correlations between the immediate and long-term time frames, ranging from extremely low to extremely high. Based on these results, the decision was made to proceed by analyzing both time frames separately.

A series of Principal factor analyses with promax rotation were conducted, rotating factors that had an eigenvalue greater than one. These factor analyses examined

all of the items for each scenario (one factor analysis per scenario) for the immediate time frame, and then for the long-term time frame to see if the domains of concern (God, self, victim(s), others/society, relationship) emerged as separate factors. The reasoning behind doing the factor analyses separately for each scenario as well as for each time frame was because collapsing them would have resulted in too many items for the SPSS program to analyze at once (there were 87 motivation items per scenario, per time frame). Although there was some variability in item loadings, in every case, the first five were factors that represented the five hypothesized domains of concern (God, self, victim, others and society, and relationship). Given this finding, the next step was to do a factor analysis on the items for each domain, to explore whether or not the hypothesized specific types of concern would exist as separate factors.

Within the five general domains of concern (God, self, victim(s), others/society, relationship), factor analyses were performed within each of the three scenarios, as well as across each of the three scenarios, separately for each time frame, for a total of eight factor analyses per domain. Following this, the factors that emerged for each domain were examined to assess whether or not similar subscales had emerged. Items that consistently loaded onto a similar factor were assigned to a subscale. I, as well as a faculty member from Brock University, individually examined each of the sets of factor analyses within domains and came up with proposed subscales. Comparisons of our work demonstrated an almost identical list of subscales and corresponding items. The only discrepancy was within the Self domain where one judge thought that three subscales best summarized the analyses while the other thought four. Following discussion, it was

decided to proceed with three. Table 7 lists the general domains of concern followed by the subscales that emerged in that particular domain. Items that are in bold are the items that were ultimately retained (see the “Reliability Analyses” section for more information on how the retained items were chosen).

One interesting piece of information to note from those analyses (with items from all scenarios combined), was that in some cases (e.g., Others domain), the same items showed up as three different factors with each factor being defined by the situation. In other words, items from the drunken scenario formed one factor, while the same items from the lunch scenario showed up as another factor, and the same items, but from the work scenario, showed up as yet another factor. Although these factors were moderately to highly correlated with each other (.45 - .59 for the Others domain), they did emerge as three separate factors, suggesting situational variation in individuals’ scores.

Reliability Analyses

Item analyses, including the calculation of Cronbach’s alpha were conducted with the eleven subscales, examining three scores: Immediately, long-term, and combined (immediately and long-term). Cronbach’s alphas for the subscales were quite high, ranging for instance, for the immediate and long-term time frames, from .83 to .98. However, given the large number of items (each item appeared three times in each time frame: Once for each scenario) these results were not surprising.

The second purpose of these reliability analyses was, as with the factor analyses, to reduce the number of items in the questionnaire. To this end, the inter-item correlations for each subscale were examined. In order to reduce items, first, the above mentioned

Table 7

Domains, Subscales and Corresponding Items

Domain	Subscale	Item
God	God angered	God not helping me when I need it
		God being angry
		God forgiving me
		Being viewed badly by God
		God feeling bitter
		God feeling badly
		God seeing my actions as disregarding God's values
		God seeing my actions as breaking God's law
	Relationship with others	The person(s) I hurt losing faith in God
		The person(s) I hurt being less likely to turn to God in times of need Others being less likely to turn to God in times of need
Self	Relationship with self	Losing my relationship with God
		My relationship with God not being as good as it used to be
		God having no respect for me
		How God may be affected if my relationship with God changes
		How God may be feeling badly because God can no longer trust me
	Damaged self-worth	My losing faith in God
		My being less likely to turn to God in times of need
		Coming to terms with how badly I feel
		Alleviating the guilt or shame that I feel
		The person(s) I hurt forgiving me
		Restoring my sense of being a good/decent person
		Coming to an understanding of what I did and why
		Forgiving myself

Table 7 Continued
Domains, Subscales and Corresponding Items

Domain	Subscale	Item
Justice		Making things right
		Restoring justice
		Doing what is fair
Victim(s)	Impression Management	Others being angry Being viewed badly by others Others forgiving me
	Damaged self-worth	The person I hurt blaming himself/herself The person I hurt being disappointed with himself/herself The person I hurt losing their self-esteem The person(s) I hurt thinking I blame them at least partially for what happened Others blaming the person(s) I hurt
	Emotional well-being	The person(s) I hurt being afraid that I will hurt them again in the future The person(s) I hurt being afraid to trust people The person(s) I hurt feeling bitter The person(s) I hurt feeling badly The person(s) I hurt feeling vulnerable The person(s) I hurt suffering from shock The person(s) I hurt no longer believing the world is a just of fair place

Table 7 Continued
Domains, Subscales and Corresponding Items

Domain	Subscale	Item
Others	Emotional well-being	<p>Others being afraid to trust people Others feeling bitter</p> <p>Others feeling badly Others feeling vulnerable because my actions undermined society's values/norms Others being afraid I could hurt someone else in the future Others suffering from shock</p>
Relationship	Relationship with victim	<p>Losing my relationship with the person(s) that I hurt My relationship with the person(s) I hurt not being as good as it used to be</p> <p>Keeping the relationship going even if it's terrible How the person(s) I hurt could be affected if our relationship ends</p> <p>The person(s) I hurt having no respect for me How the person(s) I hurt could be affected if our relationship changes How the person(s) I hurt may be feeling badly because they can no longer trust me</p>
	Relationship with others	<p>Losing my relationships with others My relationships with others not being as good as it used to be</p> <p>How others may be feeling badly because they can no longer trust me Others having too much power over me</p> <p>Others being intimidated by me</p>

factor analyses were re-examined to locate which item loaded the highest onto that subscale. Next, using the data from the inter-item correlations, any item that had a high inter-item correlation with the selected item was deleted from the subscale, on the assumption that ideally, inter-item correlations should fall within a range of low to moderate correlations (Clark & Watson, 1995). Given that each item was actually six items, the goal was to reduce each subscale to a maximum of three items. Items that are in bold in the above Table 7 are the items that were retained for each subscale.

Following the choice of items, reliability analyses were re-run on the new, shortened subscales. These analyses were performed on the immediate time frame, the long-term time frame, and the two time frames combined. The purpose of these analyses was to ensure that the subscales still retained a relatively high alpha and as well, for the most part, displayed mean inter-item correlations ranging from about .15 - .50 (Clark & Watson, 1995). See Table 8 for the mean inter-item correlations and alphas for the immediate and long-term time frames, and combined time frames (immediate and long-term).

Correlation Analyses

Before beginning any correlation analyses, total subscale scores for each participant were calculated. Given that there existed missing data, the Mean function was used. Total scores were calculated across the three scenarios for the immediate time frame, the long-term time frame, and the two time frames combined. Correlation analyses were then conducted on the immediate and long-term total scores (for each subscale) in order to see if a subscale score at Time 1 (immediately) correlated more highly with itself

Table 8

Mean Inter-item Correlations and Alphas for Reduced Subscales

Domain and Subscale	Time Frame	Mean Inter-item Correlation	Alpha
Self			
Damaged Self-worth	Immediate	.51	.86
	Long Term	.37	.78
	Combination	.31	.85
Justice	Immediate	.43	.87
	Long Term	.35	.83
	Combination	.30	.89
Impression Management	Immediate	.40	.80
	Long Term	.37	.77
	Combination	.38	.88
Relationship			
Relationship with Victim	Immediate	.33	.82
	Long Term	.32	.80
	Combination	.26	.87
Relationship with Others	Immediate	.45	.88
	Long Term	.38	.85
	Combination	.39	.92
Victim(s)			
Damaged Self-worth	Immediate	.50	.90
	Long Term	.41	.86
	Combination	.43	.93

Table 8 Continued
Mean Inter-item Correlations and Alphas for Reduced Subscales

Domain and Subscale	Time Frame	Mean Inter-item Correlation	Alpha
Emotional Well-being	Immediate	.40	.80
	Long Term	.35	.76
	Combination	.32	.85
Others			
Emotional Well-being	Immediate	.47	.84
	Long Term	.43	.82
	Combination	.47	.91
God			
God angered	Immediate	.61	.90
	Long Term	.60	.90
	Combination	.62	.95
Relationship with Self			
	Immediate	.66	.92
	Long Term	.70	.93
	Combination	.68	.96
Relationship with Others			
	Immediate	.65	.92
	Long Term	.61	.90
	Combination	.64	.95

in Time 2 (long-term), than with any other subscale. For ease of presentation, the results of these analyses are offered in three tables: Correlations among subscales within the immediate time frame (Table 9), correlations among subscales within the long-term time frame (Table 10), and correlations of each subscale with itself at the immediate versus the long-term time frame (Table 11). Examination of these tables made it clear that virtually all of the subscales were correlated with each other. Furthermore, it was not always the case that scores for the immediate time frame correlated most highly with scores for the long-term time frame of the same subscale. For instance, the damaged Self-worth subscale of the Self domain only correlated .35 with itself in the immediate versus long-term time frame, while it correlated .60 with the justice subscale (in the Self domain) in the immediate time frame analysis.

One pattern that did emerge however, is that quite often, on the whole, different subscales tended to correlate higher with subscale scores from the same time frame. Given this relationship, separate analyses were performed on the two time frames instead of just combining them into one grand score.

Finally, correlations among subscales with the immediate and long-term time frames combined were calculated (Table 12). This particular analysis showed that all three God subscales were highly correlated. Based on this, the decision was made to collapse them into one total Concern about God score. In addition, the Victim subscales were highly correlated with each other as well as with the Other Well-being subscale. Based on this, the decision was made to collapse the Victim and Others subscales into one total Victim and Others Concerns score. Furthermore, the two Relationship

Table 9

Correlations (N) among Subscales for the Immediate Time Frame

Subscale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. God angered	-									
2. Relationship Between God & Self	.93* (216)	-								
3. Relationship Between God & Others	.72* (214)	.73* (212)	-							
4. Damaged Self-worth Concerns	.35* (214)	.36* (212)	.39** (213)	-						
5. Justice Concerns	.31* (216)	.31* (214)	.39* (214)	.60* (218)	-					
6. Impression Management Concerns	.32* (215)	.28* (213)	.38* (214)	.51* (217)	.44* (220)	-				
7. Victim Self-worth	.40* (214)	.44* (213)	.59* (213)	.56* (216)	.58* (219)	.41* (219)	-			
8. Victim Well-being	.32* (216)	.35* (214)	.48* (214)	.53* (218)	.68* (221)	.52* (220)	.70* (219)	-		

Table 9 Continued

Correlations (N) among Subscales for the Immediate Time Frame

Subscale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
9. Others Well-being	.43* (215)	.42* (213)	.61* (214)	.60* (217)	.58* (220)	.58* (220)	.77* (219)	.68* (220)	-	-
10. Relationship with Victim	.33* (216)	.35* (214)	.42* (214)	.78* (216)	.65* (219)	.58* (218)	.59* (217)	.70* (219)	.59* (218)	-
11. Relationship with Others	.42* (215)	.44* (213)	.50* (214)	.69* (216)	.63* (219)	.67* (219)	.75* (218)	.71* (219)	.83* (219)	.70* (218)

* $p < .01$.

Table 10

Correlations (N) among Subscales for the Long-Term Time Frame

Subscale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. God angered	-									
2. God Relationship with Self	.93** (221)	-								
3. God Relationship with Others	.73** (221)	.74** (221)	-							
4. Damaged Self-worth	.21** (221)	.20** (221)	.20** (221)	-						
5. Justice	.22** (221)	.23** (221)	.28** (221)	.53** (221)	-					
6. Impression Management	.27** (217)	.23** (217)	.29** (217)	.54** (217)	.48** (217)	-				
7. Victim Self-worth	.38** (220)	.42** (220)	.48** (220)	.31** (220)	.48** (220)	.38** (216)	-			

Table 10 Continued
Correlations (*N*) among Subscales for the Long-Term Time Frame

Subscale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
8. Victim Well-being	.15* (217)	.18** (217)	.24** (217)	.35** (217)	.39** (217)	.40** (213)	.37** (217)	-		
9. Others Well-being	.39** (221)	.40** (221)	.54** (221)	.38** (221)	.50** (221)	.52** (217)	.73** (220)	.40** (217)	-	
10. Relationship with Victim	.25** (220)	.30** (220)	.32** (220)	.58** (220)	.54** (220)	.60** (216)	.46** (220)	.54** (217)	.48** (220)	-
11. Relationship with Others	.40** (220)	.41** (220)	.42** (220)	.49** (220)	.50** (220)	.70** (216)	.67** (220)	.44** (217)	.75** (220)	.58** (220)

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

Table 11

Correlations (N) of each Subscale with itself at the Immediate versus Long-term Time Frame

God angered	God Relation- ship with Self	God Relation- ship with Others	Damaged Self-worth	Justice	Impression Management	Victim Self- worth	Victim Well- being	Others Well- being	Relation- ship with Victim	Relation- ship with Others
.92* (216)	.93* (214)	.70* (216)	.35* (218)	.46* (221)	.73* (216)	.79* (218)	.39* (217)	.79* (220)	.52* (218)	.52* (218)

* $p < .01$.

Table 12

Correlations between Subscales (Immediate and Long-term Time Frames Combined)

Subscale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. God angered	—									
2. God Relationship with Self	.94*	—								
3. God Relationship with Others	.73*	.73*	—							
4. Damaged Self-worth	.31*	.32*	.33*	—						

Table 11

Correlations (N) of each Subscale with itself at the Immediate versus Long-term Time Frame

God angered	God Relation- ship with Self	God Relation- ship with Others	Damaged Self-worth	Justice	Impression Management	Victim Self- worth	Victim Well- being	Others Well- being	Relation- ship with Victim	Relation- ship with Others
.92* (216)	.93* (214)	.70* (216)	.35* (218)	.46* (221)	.73* (216)	.79* (218)	.39* (217)	.79* (220)	.52* (218)	.52* (218)

* $p < .01$.

Table 12

Correlations between Subscales (Immediate and Long-term Time Frames Combined)

Subscale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. God angered	—									
2. God Relationship with Self	.94*	—								
3. God Relationship with Others	.73*	.73*	—							
4. Damaged Self-worth	.31*	.32*	.33*	—						

subscales were highly correlated. Based on this, the decision was made to collapse them into one total Relationship Concerns score. Table 13 depicts the correlations among the new and final subscales.

Examination of the correlation matrix in Table 13 makes it quite clear that the Victim and Others Concerns and Relationship Concerns subscales were highly correlated. Despite this, the decision was made to keep these subscales separate, as in our minds, they were conceptually different. The Victim and Others Concerns subscale refers to emotions that other people may be feeling as a result of the transgression while the Relationship Concerns subscale refers to a change in the relationship between the perpetrator and other people. The high correlations between these subscales may be because an individual who is very concerned about maintaining relationships will also be concerned about how the other person is feeling, because if the other person is feeling negatively towards him/her, the chances of the relationship being adversely affected are increased.

Final Reliability Analyses

Item analyses, including the calculation of Cronbach's alpha were re-run on the newly created subscales. Table 14 shows the results for these new subscales.

Test Re-test Analysis

In order to test for the reliability of the questionnaire over time, correlation coefficients between Session 1 and Session 2 subscale scores for motives were calculated. See Table 15 for the results. Results showed a range of moderate to high test re-test reliabilities, ranging from .50 (justice immediately) to .91 (Concern about God

Table 13
Correlations between Final Subscales

Subscale	1	2	3	4	5
1. Concern about God	-				
2. Damaged Self-worth Concerns	.35*	-			
3. Justice Concerns	.34*	.58*	-		
4. Impression Management Concerns	.33*	.54*	.46*	-	
5. Victim and Others Concerns	.52*	.56*	.62*	.54*	-
6. Relationship Concerns	.45*	.66*	.61*	.70*	.82*

$N = 221$, * $p < .01$.

Table 14
Mean Inter-item Correlations and Alphas for New, Collapsed Subscales

Domain and Subscale	Time Frame	Mean Inter-item Correlation	Alpha
Total Concern about God Score	Immediate	.59	.96
	Long Term	.56	.98
	Combination	.56	.98
Total Victim and Others Concerns Score	Immediate	.41	.94
	Long Term	.33	.91
	Combination	.32	.95
Total Relationship Concerns Score	Immediate	.32	.95
	Long Term	.30	.88
	Combination	.29	.93

Table 15
Test Re-test Correlations for Motive Subscales

Subscale	r	N
Concern about God immediately	.86	117
Concern about God long-term	.86	121
Concern about God time frames collapsed	.91	122
Damaged Self-worth Concerns immediately	.77	119
Damaged Self-worth Concerns long-term	.78	121
Damaged Self-worth Concerns time frames collapsed	.79	122
Justice Concerns immediately	.50	122
Justice Concerns long-term	.61	121
Justice time Concerns frames collapsed	.56	122
Impression Management Concerns immediately	.61	122
Impression Management Concerns long-term	.70	116
Impression Management Concerns time frames collapsed	.69	122
Victim and Other Concerns immediately	.81	121
Victim and Other Concerns long-term	.83	121
Victim and Other Concerns time frames collapsed	.84	122
Relationship Concerns immediately	.79	121
Relationship Concerns long-term	.82	120
Relationship Concerns time frames collapsed	.82	122

Note: All correlations are significant at $p < .001$.

time frames collapsed).

Final Factor Analysis

With the new subscales in hand, the factor analysis on all items, across all scenarios was re-run using only these new items. This analysis was conducted to see if the five factors from the first factor analysis (using all of the items) could be replicated. An examination of the Scree Plot showed five to six possible factors. Examination of the Pattern Matrix showed a clear Concern about God factor, but otherwise, each of the factors were a jumble of items from a number of subscales and thus were not interpretable. This is not surprising, given the high degree of inter-correlation among the subscales.

Behaviours

Preliminary Analyses

Before beginning analyses with the behaviour items, frequency distributions were examined to assess the amount of missing data. Any item that had more than 5% missing data in either the immediate or long-term time frame and across all three scenarios, was deleted and not included in further analyses. Only one such question fit this criterion: "I would let the person hurt know I understand I hurt them." This item was eliminated from further analyses for both the immediate and long-term time frames.

Factor Analyses

Once again, psychometric analyses were performed using only the Session 1 data. Data from Session 2 were used only for test re-test analyses. As with the analyses for the motivations from the questionnaire, one of the primary goals of these factor analyses was to reduce the number of items in the questionnaire. Once again, prior to performing factor

analyses, correlation coefficients were calculated between the immediate and long-term time frames for each item, to see if they were highly correlated. Had they been, they could have been collapsed to create one grand behaviour score. Much like the analyses for the motivation items, these analyses showed a full range of correlations between the immediate and long-term time frames. Based on these results, the decision was made to proceed by analyzing the time frames separately.

Principal Axis factor analyses with promax rotation were performed for all of the scenarios separately for the immediate time frame and the long-term time frame. The purpose of these analyses was to determine if the two expected factors (Approach and Avoidance) emerged. As it turns out, in every factor analysis, four interpretable factors were found. Both the expected factors were there, as well as a factor that clearly depicted actions that related to denying and/or hiding what had happened, and as well, a factor that seemed to depict a sort of groveling experience. On the basis of this, items were assigned to four subscales. See Table 16 for a list of these factors and their related items (items in bold are the items that were retained following the reliability analyses). See the “Reliability Analyses” section for more on how the retained items were chosen.

Reliability Analyses

Item analyses, including the calculation of Cronbach’s alpha, were conducted with the four subscales, examining three scores: Immediately, long-term and combined (immediately and long-term). Cronbach’s alphas for the subscales were quite high ranging from .84 to .94 (for the immediate and long-term time frames combined). Given the number of items per factor, high alphas such as the ones obtained were expected.

Table 16
Behaviour Subscales and Relevant Items

Factor	Item
Approach	<p>I would go see the person(s) I hurt I would seek out the person(s) I hurt, to talk things over I would explain my actions, making sure the person(s) hurt knew I was in the wrong I would seek the advice or opinion of a friend or family member about how I could fix the situation I would call the person(s) I hurt I would go to the person(s) I hurt and explain my actions so that he/she would know it was not his/her fault I would apologize for the hurt I've caused</p>
Avoidance	<p>I would take some time to nurse myself and do something nice for myself I would give the person(s) I hurt some space I would take some time to collect my thoughts and reflect on what I've done I would do something fun to take my mind off of the situation I would work on forgiving myself I would take time for myself to work through my negative emotions I would try to come to terms with what I'd done I would go off on my own to calm myself down I would avoid the person(s) I hurt</p>
Denial and Hiding	<p>I would shift some of the blame to the person(s) I hurt I would have someone else talk to the person(s) I hurt on my behalf I would try and justify my actions I would blame someone else I would try to hide what I had done</p>
Groveling	<p>I would do whatever it took, for however long it took, to make things better I would give the person(s) I hurt gifts to make up for what I did I would prove myself over and over again to the person(s) I had hurt I would do whatever the person(s) I hurt asked of me, to try to fix the situation</p>

These reliability analyses were also performed with the goal of item reduction in mind. As such, inter-item correlations for each subscale were examined. In order to reduce items, first, the above mentioned factor analyses were re-examined to locate the item that loaded the highest onto each factor. Next, using the data from the inter-item correlations, any item that had a high inter-item correlation with the selected item was removed on the assumption that, ideally, inter-item correlations should range from low to moderate (Clark & Watson, 1995). The goal was to reduce each factor to about three or four items. Items that are in bold in Table 16 are the items that were retained for each subscale.

Following the choice of items, reliability analyses were re-run on the new, shortened subscales. These analyses were performed on the immediate time frame, the long-term time frame, and on the two time frames combined. The purpose of these analyses was to ensure that the subscales still retained a relatively high alpha and displayed mean inter-item correlations ranging from about .15-.50 (Clark & Watson, 1995). See Table 17 for the mean inter-item correlations and alphas for the immediate and long-term time frames, as well as for the combination of the two time frames.

Test Re-test Analysis

In order to test the reliability of the questionnaire over time, correlations between Session 1 and Session 2 subscale scores for behaviours were conducted (for each time frame as well as for the time frames combined). See Table 17 for the results.

Results suggested a range of moderate to high test re-test reliabilities, ranging from .63 (Approach, time frames collapsed) to .82 (Deny and Hide, immediately and time

Table 17
Mean Inter-item Correlations, Alphas, and Test Re-test Correlations for Reduced Behaviour Subscales

Factor	Time Frame	Mean Inter-item Correlation	Alpha	Test Re-test Correlation	N
Approach	Immediate	.36	.86	.68	121
	Long Term	.48	.92	.65	118
	Combination	.27	.90	.63	122
Avoidance	Immediate	.42	.90	.76	121
	Long Term	.41	.89	.79	121
	Combination	.35	.93	.80	122
Denial or Hiding	Immediate	.36	.87	.82	121
	Long Term	.37	.87	.79	121
	Combination	.36	.87	.82	122
Groveling	Immediate	.31	.84	.68	122
	Long Term	.36	.87	.77	121
	Combination	.32	.92	.78	122

Note: All test re-test correlations are significant at $p < .001$.

frames collapsed).

Correlation Analyses

Before beginning any correlation analyses, a total score for each participant, for each factor, was calculated, using the Mean function. Total scores were calculated across the three scenarios for the immediate time frame, the long-term time frame and the two time frames combined. Correlation analyses were then run on the immediate and long-term total scores, in order to see if a score at Time 1 (immediately) correlated highest with its score at Time 2 (long-term), rather than with any other subscale. See Table 18 for correlations for each time frame as well as for the time frames combined. Table 19

Table 18

Correlations (N) of Behaviour Subscales within each Time Frame

	<u>Immediately</u>			<u>Long-term</u>			<u>Combined</u>		
Subscale	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
1. Approach	-			-			-		
2. Avoidance	.16* (219)	-		.30** (216)	-		.22** (221)	-	
3. Denial/Hid- ing	-.16* (216)	.27** (219)	-	.09 (216)	.32** (221)	-	-.05 (221)	.33** (221)	-
4. Groveling	.47** (220)	.26** (220)	.23** (220)	.54** (216)	.26** (220)	.32** (220)	.54** (221)	.26** (221)	.34** (221)

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

represents the correlations of each subscale in the immediate time frame versus the long-term time frame.

Examination of Table 19 shows that for the most part, the subscales were low to moderately correlated with each other. While the Groveling and Approach subscales were the most highly correlated, they are conceptually different, as groveling seems to be almost an extreme form of the approach behaviours. In addition, the correlation of .54 was not deemed high enough to warrant a merging of the two.

Results (Tables 18 and 19) showed that most of the subscales were correlated with each other. As with the motivation items, it was not always the case that scores for the immediate time frame correlated most highly with scores for the long-term time frame of the same subscale. For instance, the Approach subscale correlated .30 with itself

Table 19

Correlations (N) of each Subscale with itself at the Immediate versus Long- term Time Frame

Approach	Avoidance	Denial/Hiding	Groveling
.30*	.60*	.81*	.72*
(215)	(220)	(220)	(220)

* $p < .01$.

in the immediate versus long-term time frame, while in the long-term time frame it correlated .54 with the Groveling subscale. Once again, it was often the case that different scores tended to correlate higher with subscale scores from the same time frame. This again spoke to the need to perform separate analyses on the two time frames instead of combining them into one grand score.

Final Factor Analysis

Using the reduced items for each factor, the factor analysis on all items, across all scenarios was re-run. The purpose of this was to see if the same factors emerged once again. Both the Denial and Hiding factor and the Avoidance factor emerged as separate factors with their items loading on to the appropriate factor. An Approach factor also emerged, however, this time, the Groveling items also loaded on it. The fourth factor that emerged was the Approach behaviours for the high severity situation only. These items had not loaded on to the aforementioned Approach factor. These findings once again speak to the importance of examining situational variability.

Social Desirability

Reliability Analyses

Before beginning any analyses, the appropriate items were reverse-scored. Next, using the Mean function, total scores for each participant, and for each subscale, were

calculated in two ways. The scoring key for the BIDR was set to give a score of 0 for any score ranging from 1-4, and a score of 1 for any score ranging from 5-6. It was thought that giving such a limited range of scores (0-1) might lead to a low Cronbach's alpha; therefore, total scores for each subscale were also calculated by simply summing the original scores given by participants. Following this, Cronbach's alpha was calculated for both of the BIDR subscales, for both of the scoring methods. Results revealed that the Cronbach's alphas were similar for both scoring methods (see Table 20); therefore, the decision was made to continue analyses with only the scores that had been scored as per the instructions of the BIDR (i.e., scored 0-1).

Table 20

Cronbach's Alpha for the Two BIDR Scoring Methods

BIDR Subscale	0-1 Scoring Method	Summed Scores Method
Self-deceptive Enhancement	.65	.70
Impression Management	.72	.80

Correlation Analyses

To explore the validity of the forgiveness-seeking subscales, correlations were calculated between the two BIDR subscales and the forgiveness-seeking motive and behaviour subscales. The same procedure was followed for the Behaviour subscales. See Table 21 for these results for the immediate and long-term time frames as well as for the two time frames combined. Examination of the motive subscales in Table 21 revealed only one significant correlation: The Self Deceptive Enhancement subscale of the BIDR was negatively correlated with the Damaged Self-worth motive subscale in the long-term

Table 21
Correlations (N) between the BIDR and the Motive and Behaviour Subscales

Subscale	<u>Immediately</u>		<u>Long-term</u>		<u>Combined</u>	
	BIDR SDE	BIDR IM	BIDR SDE	BIDR IM	BIDR SDE	BIDR IM
Concern about God	.07 (215)	.06 (214)	.02 (220)	.06 (218)	.04 (220)	.06 (218)
Damaged Self-worth Concerns	-.03 (217)	-.02 (215)	-.16* (220)	-.02 (218)	-.12 (220)	-.01 (218)
Justice Concerns	.06 (220)	.10 (218)	.01 (220)	.12 (218)	.04 (220)	.13 (218)
Impression Management Concerns	-.07 (219)	-.07 (218)	-.08 (216)	-.02 (214)	-.08 (220)	-.04 (218)
Victim and Others Concerns	.10 (220)	.04 (218)	.03 (220)	.08 (218)	.01 (220)	-.06 (218)
Relationship Concerns	.03 (219)	-.01 (217)	-.02 (219)	-.01 (217)	-.01 (220)	-.02 (218)
Approach	.08 (219)	.17* (217)	.12 (215)	.08 (213)	.16* (218)	.11 (220)
Avoidance	-.03 (219)	-.02 (217)	-.08 (220)	.05 (218)	.02 (218)	-.06 (220)
Denial/Hiding	-.04 (219)	-.20** (217)	-.14* (220)	-.16** (218)	-.19** (218)	-.10 (220)
Groveling	.00 (220)	-.03 (218)	-.04 (219)	-.05 (217)	-.03 (218)	-.02 (220)

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

Note: SDE = Self Deceptive Enhancement, IM = Impression Management

time frame. Given the number of correlations, and the small size of this correlation, this result is likely due to Type 1 error. However, should the finding replicate, it makes sense, as individuals who feel that their self-worth has been damaged are unlikely to respond with biased (positive) self-descriptions. On the other hand, the Impression Management subscale of the BIDR failed to correlate with the impression management subscales of the Forgiveness-seeking Questionnaire.

Examination of the behaviour subscales in Table 21 also revealed only low correlations. In the immediate time frame, the Approach subscale was positively correlated with the Impression Management subscale of the BIDR. It may very well be that some individuals feel the need to approach their victim to engage in forgiveness-seeking behaviours such as apology because they feel that that is what is expected of them, and thus fear that they will be viewed badly if they do not. The Denial and Hiding subscale were significantly negatively correlated with the Impression Management subscale of the BIDR for both the immediate and long-term time frames. This may be an indication of response bias. Specifically, people having low scores on BIDR subscales may have been more willing to admit to denying and hiding, both of which are rather socially undesirable responses. Conversely, people who scored higher on these subscales may have been less willing to endorse these items. However, given that these correlations were small, this effect was not of great concern. The Denial and Hiding subscale was also negatively correlated with the Self-deceptive Enhancement subscale of the BIDR for both the long-term time frame and the combined time frames. It may be that, in the long-term, individuals who denied or hid what they had done actually came to believe that they did

not do it, or simply viewed themselves more positively to help keep up their charade. Conversely, it may be that individuals who are predisposed to view themselves in a positive, biased manner are more prone to engage in denial and hiding behaviours.

Personality (HEXACO)

Reliability Analyses

Before beginning any analyses, the appropriate items on the HEXACO were reverse-scored. Next, using the Mean function, a total score for each participant, for each subscale, was calculated. Following this, Cronbach's alpha was calculated for the six HEXACO subscales. Cronbach's alpha for the subscales was adequate, ranging from .75 (Conscientiousness) to .85 (Agreeableness).

BIDR and HEXACO Correlation Analyses

Correlational analyses were first run on the BIDR and the HEXACO. Emotionality was negatively correlated with Self-deceptive Enhancement ($r = -.36, p < .001$). The opposite was true of Extraversion ($r = .15, p = .025$), Agreeableness ($r = .14, p = .04$), and Conscientiousness ($r = .31, p < .001$). The Impression Management subscale of the BIDR was positively correlated with Honesty-Humility ($r = .40, p < .001$), Agreeableness ($r = .23, p = .001$), and Conscientiousness ($r = .24, p < .001$).

The next correlational analyses were conducted on the HEXACO subscales only. Agreeableness was positively correlated with Honesty-Humility ($r = .23, p < .001$) and Openness to Experience ($r = .15, p = .031$), and negatively correlated with Emotionality ($r = -.22, p = .001$). Conscientiousness was positively correlated with Honesty-Humility ($r = .21, p = .001$), while Openness to Experience was positively correlated with

Extraversion ($r = .19, p = .004$). These correlations are similar to the ones found by Lee et al. (2005).

Motivation and HEXACO Correlation Analyses

Correlational analyses were run on the HEXACO subscales and the forgiveness-seeking motive subscales. All of these analyses were conducted on the scores for the immediate time frame (see Table 22), the long-term time frame (see Table 23) and the two time frames combined (see Table 24).

Examination of these three tables revealed that all of the correlations were relatively low. In the immediate time frame, Emotionality was positively correlated

Table 22
Correlations (N) between the HEXACO and the Motive Subscales, Immediate Time Frame

Subscale	H	E	X	A	C	O
Concern about God (215)	.04	.11	.03	.01	.15*	-.28**
Damaged Self-worth Concerns (217)	-.06	.13	.01	.00	.01	-.09
Justice Concerns (220)	.02	.08	.05	-.01	.04	-.00
Impression Management Concerns (219)	-.07	.33**	.10	-.05	-.03	-.21**
Victim and Other Concerns (220)	-.00	.12	.13	.03	.08	-.06
Relationship Concerns (219)	-.02	.16*	.12	.00	.03	-.14*

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

Note: H = Honesty-Humility, E = Emotionality, X = Extraversion, A = Agreeableness, C = Conscientiousness, O = Openness to Experience.

Table 23

Correlations (N) between the HEXACO and the Motive Subscales, Long-term Time Frame

Subscale	H	E	X	A	C	O
Concern about God (220)	.08	.13	-.04	.01	.11	-.30**
Damaged Self-worth Concerns (220)	.03	.28**	.05	.07	.03	-.07
Justice Concerns (220)	.10	.07	.05	.07	.09	-.05
Impression Management Concerns (216)	-.14*	.32**	.02	-.06	.04	-.26**
Victim and Other Concerns (220)	.03	.18*	.06	.03	.12	-.15*
Relationship Concerns (219)	-.02	.24**	.10	.03	.03	-.23**

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

Note: H = Honesty-Humility, E = Emotionality, X = Extraversion, A = Agreeableness, C = Conscientiousness, O = Openness to Experience.

Table 24

Correlations between the HEXACO and the Motive Subscales, Time Frames Combined

Subscale	H	E	X	A	C	O
Concern about God	.07	.13*	-.01	.00	.13	-.29**
Damaged Self-worth Concerns	-.01	.24**	.05	.04	.02	-.09
Justice Concerns	.07	.09	.06	.03	.07	-.03
Impression Management Concerns	-.10	.35**	.07	-.06	.01	-.25**
Victim and Other Concerns	.02	.16*	.11	.04	.10	-.12
Relationship Concerns	-.01	.21**	.12	.03	.03	-.19**

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

$N = 220$

Note: H = Honesty-Humility, E = Emotionality, X = Extraversion, A = Agreeableness, C = Conscientiousness, O = Openness to Experience.

with Impression Management Concerns and Relationship Concerns, while Conscientiousness was positively correlated with Concern about God. In addition, Openness to Experience was negatively correlated with Concern about God, Impression Management Concerns, and Relationship Concerns.

In the long-term time frame, Honesty-Humility was negatively correlated with Impression Management Concerns, while Emotionality was positively correlated with Damaged Self-worth Concerns, Impression Management Concerns, Victim and Others Concerns, and Relationship Concerns. In addition, Openness to Experience was negatively correlated with Concern about God, Impression Management Concerns, Victim and Others Concerns, and Relationship Concerns.

When the two time frames were combined, Emotionality was positively correlated with Concern about God, Damaged Self-worth Concerns, Impression Management Concerns, Victim and Others Concerns, and Relationship Concerns. In addition, Openness to Experience was negatively correlated with Concern about God, Impression Management Concerns, and Relationship Concerns.

Behaviour and HEXACO Correlation Analyses

Correlation analyses were run on the HEXACO subscales and the forgiveness-seeking behaviour subscales. All of these analyses were conducted on the scores for the immediate time frame (see Table 25), the long-term time frame (see Table 26) and the two time frames combined (see Table 27).

Examination of the tables revealed that the results were characterized by relatively low correlations. In the immediate time frame, Honesty-Humility,

Table 25

Correlations (N) between the HEXACO and the Behaviour Subscales, Immediate Time Frame

Subscale	H	E	X	A	C	O
Approach (219)	.10	.01	.09	.04	.07	.01
Avoidance (219)	-.04	.02	-.05	.05	-.10	-.01
Denial/Hiding (219)	-.41**	.07	-.06	-.14*	-.25**	-.08
Groveling (220)	-.12	.16*	-.06	-.02	.03	-.02

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

Note: H = Honesty-Humility, E = Emotionality, X = Extraversion, A = Agreeableness, C = Conscientiousness, O = Openness to Experience.

Table 26

Correlations (N) between the HEXACO and the Behaviour Subscales, Long-term Time Frame

Subscale	H	E	X	A	C	O
Approach (215)	.06	.16*	.14*	.06	.17*	-.11
Avoidance (220)	-.01	.18**	-.02	.03	.07	.01
Denial/Hiding (220)	-.36**	.14*	-.08	-.15*	-.20**	-.10
Groveling (219)	-.13	.17*	-.01	-.02	.04	-.15*

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

Note: H = Honesty-Humility, E = Emotionality, X = Extraversion, A = Agreeableness, C = Conscientiousness, O = Openness to Experience.

Table 27
Correlations between the HEXACO and the Behaviour Subscales, Time Frames Combined

Subscale	H	E	X	A	C	O
Approach	.10	.12	.15*	.06	.15*	-.06
Avoidance	-.03	.11	-.04	.05	-.01	.00
Denial/Hiding	-.40**	.12	-.08	-.16*	-.24**	-.09
Groveling	-.14*	.18**	.03	-.02	.04	-.08

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

$N = 220$

Note: H = Honesty-Humility, E = Emotionality, X = Extraversion, A = Agreeableness, C = Conscientiousness, O = Openness to Experience.

Agreeableness and Conscientiousness were negatively correlated with Denial and Hiding behaviours. In addition, Emotionality was positively correlated with Groveling behaviours. In the long-term time frame, results showed that Emotionality, Extraversion and Conscientiousness were positively correlated with Approach behaviours. Curiously, Emotionality was also positively correlated with Avoidance behaviours. In addition, Honesty-Humility, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness were negatively correlated with Denial and Hiding behaviours, while Emotionality was positively correlated with these. Furthermore, Emotionality and Openness to Experience were positively correlated with Groveling behaviours.

When the two time frames were combined, results showed that Extraversion and Conscientiousness were more positively correlated to Approach behaviours. In addition, Honesty-Humility, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness were negatively correlated with Denial and Hiding behaviours. Furthermore, Honesty-Humility was negatively correlated

with Groveling behaviours, while Emotionality was positively correlated with Groveling behaviours.

Motives and Behaviours

Correlation Analyses between Motive and Behaviour Subscales

In order to examine whether having certain forgiveness-seeking motives are associated with the use of a particular forgiveness-seeking behaviour, correlational analyses were performed on the motive and behaviour subscales. Table 28 shows the significant correlations for the motive subscales with the Approach subscale, Table 29 the correlations for the motive subscales with the Avoidance subscale, Table 30 the correlations for the motive subscales with the Denial and Hiding subscale, and Table 31 the correlations for the motive subscales with the Groveling subscale.

A large number of significant correlations ranging from low to high were discovered. When examining the use of Approach behaviours, in the immediate as well as long-term time frame, the highest correlation was found with those experiencing Justice Concerns in the immediate time frame. Examination of the Avoidance behaviours showed that those immediately experiencing Damaged Self-worth Concerns were most likely to engage in these behaviours in the immediate time frame. Similarly, those experiencing Damaged Self-worth Concerns in the long-term were most likely to engage in Avoidance behaviours in the long-term. In addition, some individuals who were experiencing Victim and Others Concerns and/or Relationship Concerns in the immediate time frame were highly likely to engage in Avoidance behaviours in that same time-frame. The highest correlation between the motives subscales and the Denying and

Table 28

Significant Correlations between the Motive Subscales and the Approach Subscale

Subscale	<u>Time frame</u>			<u>Immediate</u>			<u>Long-term</u>			<u>Collapsed</u>		
	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N
Damaged Self-worth Concerns immediately	.32	<.001	217	.16	.017	215	.29	<.001	218			
Damaged Self-worth Concerns long-term	.17	.014	220	.34	<.001	216	.32	<.001	221			
Damaged Self-worth Concerns time frames collapsed	.31	<.001	220	.37	<.001	216	.38	<.001	221			
Justice Concerns immediately	.46	<.001	220	.17	.012	216	.39	<.001	221			
Justice Concerns long-term	.20	.002	220	.48	<.001	216	.43	<.001	221			
Justice Concerns time frames collapsed	.40	<.001	220	.37	<.001	216	.38	<.001	221			
Impression Management Concerns immediately	.25	<.001	219	.19	.005	216	.28	<.001	220			
Impression Management Concerns long-term	-	-	-	.40	<.001	214	.32	<.001	217			
Impression Management Concerns time frames collapsed	.20	.003	220	.31	<.001	216	.32	<.001	221			
Victim and Other Concerns immediately	.38	<.001	220				.32	<.001	221			
Victim and Other Concerns long-term	.15	.024	220	.34	<.001	216	.31	<.001	221			
Victim and Other Concerns time frames collapsed	.30	<.001	220	.25	<.001	216	.35	<.001	221			

Table 28 Continued

Significant Correlations between the Motive Subscales and the Approach Subscale

Subscale	<u>Time frame</u>			<u>Immediate</u>			<u>Long-term</u>			<u>Collapsed</u>		
	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N
Relationship Concerns immediately	.37	<.001	220	.14	.039	215	.32	<.001	220			
Relationship Concerns long-term	.18	.009	219	.41	<.001	215	.32	<.001	220			
Relationship Concerns time frames collapsed	.31	<.001	220	.28	<.001	216	.37	<.001	221			

Table 29

Significant Correlations between the Motive Subscales and the Avoidance Subscale

Subscale	<u>Time frame</u>			<u>Immediate</u>			<u>Long-term</u>			<u>Collapsed</u>		
	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N
Concern about God immediately	.34	<.001	215	.21	.002	216	.31	<.001	216			
Concern about God long-term	.22	.001	220	.18	.008	221	.23	.001	221			
Concern about God time frames collapsed	.28	<.001	220	.20	.003	221	.28	<.001	221			
Damaged Self-worth Concerns immediately	.73	<.001	217	.39	<.001	218	.63	<.001	218			
Damaged Self-worth Concerns long-term	.29	<.001	220	.64	<.001	221	.51	<.001	221			
Damaged Self-worth Concerns time frames collapsed	.65	<.001	220	.60	<.001	221	.70	<.001	221			
Justice Concerns immediately	.42	<.001	220	.22	.001	221	.20	<.001	221			

Table 29 Continued

Significant Correlations between the Motive Subscales and the Avoidance Subscale

Subscale	<u>Time frame</u>			<u>Immediate</u>			<u>Long-term</u>			<u>Collapsed</u>		
	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N
Justice Concerns long-term	.20	.004	220	.39	<.001	221	.32	<.001	221	.32	<.001	221
Justice Concerns time frames collapsed	.37	<.001	220	.35	<.001	221	.40	.001	221			
Impression Management Concerns immediately	.35	<.001	219	.28	<.001	220	.36	<.001	220			
Impression Management Concerns long-term	-	-	-	.35	<.001	217	.27	<.001	217			
Impression Management Concerns time frames collapsed	.27	<.001	220	.34	<.001	221	.34	<.001	221			
Victim and Other Concerns immediately	.56	<.001	220	.32	<.001	221	.50	<.001	221			
Victim and Other Concerns long-term	.33	<.001	220	.43	<.001	221	.41	<.001	221			
Victim and Other Concerns time frames collapsed	.50	<.001	220	.41	<.001	221	.51	<.001	221			
Relationship Concerns immediately	.54	<.001	219	.33	<.001	220	.49	<.001	220			
Relationship Concerns long-term	.28	<.001	219	.42	<.001	220	.40	<.001	220			
Relationship Concerns time frames collapsed	.47	<.001	220	.40	<.001	221	.49	<.001	221			

Table 30

Significant Correlations between the Motive Subscales and the Denial and Hiding Subscale

Subscale	Time frame		Immediate		Long-term		Collapsed		
	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N
Concern about God immediately	.15	.03	216	.25	<.001	216	.21	.002	216
Concern about God long-term				.26	<.001	221	.21	.002	221
Concern about God time frames collapsed	.13	.047	220	.27	<.001	221	.21	.001	221
Damaged Self-worth Concerns immediately	.19	.004	217	.20	.003	218	.21	.002	218
Damaged Self-worth Concerns long-term	.13	.047	220	.19	.004	221	.17	.011	221
Damaged Self-worth Concerns time frames collapsed	.19	.005	220	.24	<.001	221	.23	.001	221
Justice Concerns long-term				.18	.008	221	.14	.034	221
Justice Concerns time frames collapsed				.16	.015	221	.14	.038	221
Impression Management Concerns immediately	.25	<.001	219	.28	<.001	220	.28	<.001	220
Impression Management Concerns long-term	.26	<.001	216	.33	<.001	217	.37	<.001	220
Impression Management Concerns time frames collapsed	.27	<.001	220	.32	<.001	221	.31	<.001	221
Victim and Other Concerns immediately				.18	.007	221	.16	.016	221

Table 30 Continued

Significant Correlations between the Motive Subscales and the Denial and Hiding Subscale

Subscale	<u>Time frame</u>			<u>Immediate</u>			<u>Long-term</u>			<u>Collapsed</u>		
	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N
Victim and Other Concerns long-term	.17	.011	220	.32	<.001	221	.26	<.001	221	.26	<.001	221
Victim and Other Concerns time frames collapsed	.15	.023	220	.27	<.001	221	.22	.001	220	.22	.001	220
Relationship Concerns immediately	.19	.005	220	.22	.001	220	.30	<.001	220	.28	<.001	221
Relationship Concerns long-term	.23	.001	219	.35	<.001	220	.30	<.001	220	.28	<.001	221
Relationship Concerns time frames collapsed	.22	.001	220	.31	<.001	221	.28	<.001	221	.28	<.001	221

Table 31

Significant Correlations between the Motive Subscales and the Groveling Subscale

Subscale	<u>Time frame</u>			<u>Immediate</u>			<u>Long-term</u>			<u>Collapsed</u>		
	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N
Concern about God immediately	.29	<.001	216	.23	.001	215	.29	<.001	216	.29	<.001	216
Concern about God long-term	.27	<.001	221	.28	<.001	220	.30	<.001	221	.30	<.001	221
Concern about God time frames collapsed	.29	<.001	221	.26	<.001	220	.31	<.001	221	.31	<.001	221
Damaged Self-worth Concerns immediately	.39	<.001	218	.20	.004	217	.32	<.001	218	.32	<.001	218
Damaged Self-worth Concerns long-term	.28	<.001	221	.38	<.001	220	.35	<.001	221	.35	<.001	221
Damaged Self-worth Concerns time frames collapsed	.42	<.001	221	.34	<.001	220	.41	<.001	221	.41	<.001	221

Table 31 Continued

Significant Correlations between the Motive Subscales and the Groveling Subscale

Subscale	<u>Time frame</u>			<u>Immediate</u>			<u>Long-term</u>			<u>Collapsed</u>		
	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N
Justice Concerns immediately	.51	<.001	221	.20	.003	220	.39	<.001	221			
Justice Concerns long-term	.36	<.001	221	.42	<.001	220	.42	<.001	221			
Justice Concerns time frames collapsed	.52	<.001	221	.35	<.001	220	.47	<.001	221			
Impression Management Concerns immediately	.38	<.001	220	.30	<.001	219	.37	<.001	220			
Impression Management Concerns long-term	.34	<.001	217	.50	<.001	216	.45	<.001	217			
Impression Management Concerns time frames collapsed	.39	<.001	221	.41	<.001	220	.44	<.001	221			
Victim and Other Concerns immediately	.50	<.001	221	.22	.001	220	.40	<.001	221			
Victim and Other Concerns long-term	.40	<.001	221	.45	<.001	220	.56	<.001	216			
Victim and Other Concerns time frames collapsed	.50	<.001	221	.37	<.001	220	.47	<.001	221			
Relationship Concerns immediately	.51	<.001	220	.25	<.001	219	.42	<.001	220			
Relationship Concerns long-term	.48	<.001	220	.52	<.001	220	.54	<.001	220			
Relationship Concerns time frames collapsed	.55	<.001	221	.40	<.001	220	.51	<.001	221			

Hiding Subscale suggested that those who experienced Relationship Concerns in the long-term were more likely to engage in Denial and Hiding Behaviours in that time-frame.

Examination of the Groveling behaviours showed that those with Justice Concerns, Victim and Others Concerns, and/or Relationship Concerns in the immediate time frame were more likely to engage in groveling behaviours in that same time-frame. In addition, those with Justice Concerns, Impression Management Concerns, Victim and Others Concerns, and/or Relationship Concerns in the long-term were more likely to engage in Groveling behaviours in that long-term time frame.

Sex Differences

Sex Differences for Motives and Behaviours

T-tests were conducted on the total subscale scores (for both time frames, as well as the time frames combined) to determine if there were sex differences in terms of forgiveness-seeking motives and behaviours. In the immediate time frame, men ($M = 3.14$, $SD = 1.32$) were found to be less concerned about impression management than women ($M = 3.54$, $SD = 1.33$); $t(218) = -2.09$, $p = .038$. In the long term time frame, men ($M = 3.94$, $SD = 1.16$) were found to be less concerned about damaged self worth than women ($M = 4.42$, $SD = .95$); $t(219) = -3.25$, $p = .001$. In addition, men ($M = 3.15$, $SD = 1.18$) continued to be less concerned about impression management than women ($M = 3.53$, $SD = 1.18$); $t(215) = -2.17$, $p = .032$. When the two time frames were combined, the only significant difference was found for the motive subscale of Impression Management Concerns with men ($M = 3.15$, $SD = 1.20$) being less concerned about being viewed

badly than women ($M = 3.54$, $SD = 1.53$); $t(219) = -2.29$, $p = .023$.

Assessment of Scenario Differences

Scenario Severity

To begin with, Repeated Measures ANOVA's for how well participants were able to imagine themselves in each scenario, how realistic they found each scenario, and the level of guilt, shame, awfulness and responsibility they felt in each scenario were conducted. In these ANOVAs, whenever the sphericity assumption, which tests for equal covariances between within subject factors (Shannon & Davenport, 2000), was violated, results were interpreted using the Greenhouse-Geisser correction to degrees of freedom; this is a more conservative test of significance (Shannon & Davenport, 2000). Post-hoc means comparisons were performed using the Bonferroni Adjustment.

For how well participants were able to imagine themselves in each scenario, a significant difference was found, $F(2, 440) = 3.35$, $p = .036$. Post hoc analyses showed that participants were significantly less able to imagine themselves in the high severity, Drunk Driving scenario ($M = 2.51$, $SD = 1.35$) than in the low severity, Late Lunch scenario ($M = 2.78$, $SD = 1.43$), $p = .041$.

For how realistic participants found each scenario, a significant difference was found, $F(2, 436) = 10.02$, $p < .001$. Post hoc analyses showed that participants found the high severity scenario more realistic ($M = 3.93$, $SD = 1.18$) than the low severity scenario, ($M = 3.54$, $SD = 1.21$), $p < .001$, and the moderate severity, Workplace Gossip scenario ($M = 3.68$, $SD = 1.19$), $p = .02$.

For how guilty participants felt in each scenario, a significant difference was

found (due to a violation of the sphericity assumption, the Greenhouse-Geiser correction was used), $F(1.66, 365.98) = 59.97, p < .001$. Post hoc analyses showed that participants felt significantly more guilty in the high severity scenario ($M = 4.94, SD = .27$) than in the low severity scenario, ($M = 4.19, SD = 1.00$), $p < .001$, and the moderate severity scenario ($M = 4.40, SD = .83$), $p < .001$, and as well, felt significantly more guilty in the moderate severity scenario than in the low severity scenario, $p < .001$.

For how ashamed participants felt in each scenario, a significant difference was found (due to a violation of the sphericity assumption, the Greenhouse-Geiser correction was used), $F(1.66, 366.49) = 77.25, p < .001$. Post hoc analyses showed that participants felt significantly more ashamed in the high severity scenario ($M = 4.86, SD = .49$) than in the low severity scenario, ($M = 3.92, SD = 1.16$), $p < .001$, and the moderate severity scenario ($M = 4.43, SD = .84$), $p < .001$. In addition, participants felt significantly more ashamed in the moderate severity scenario than in the low severity scenario, $p < .001$.

For how awful participants felt in each scenario, a significant difference was found (due to a violation of the sphericity assumption, the Greenhouse-Geiser correction was used), $F(1.76, 385.55) = 93.77, p < .001$. Post hoc analyses showed that participants felt significantly more awful in the high severity scenario ($M = 4.89, SD = .42$) than in the low severity scenario, ($M = 3.93, SD = 1.11$), $p < .001$, and the moderate severity scenario ($M = 4.35, SD = .92$), $p < .001$, and as well, felt significantly more awful in the moderate severity scenario than in the low severity scenario, $p < .001$.

For how responsible participants felt in each scenario, a significant difference was found (due to a violation of the sphericity assumption, the Greenhouse-Geiser correction

was used), $F(1.79, 393.13) = 63.80, p < .001$. Post hoc analyses showed that participants felt significantly more responsible in the high severity scenario ($M = 4.88, SD = .43$) than in the low severity scenario, ($M = 4.43, SD = .84$), $p < .001$, and the moderate severity scenario ($M = 4.12, SD = .95$), $p < .001$, and as well, felt significantly more responsible in the low severity scenario than in the moderate severity scenario, $p < .001$.

Motivation Concern Differences within Scenarios

To determine if participants experienced different motivational concerns in situations of differing severity, a series of Repeated Measures ANOVAs were conducted. An ANOVA was conducted for each subscale for the immediate time frame, the long-term time frame and the two time frames combined. In these ANOVAs, whenever the sphericity assumption, which tests for equal covariances between within subject factors (Shannon & Davenport, 2000), was violated, results were interpreted using the Greenhouse-Geisser correction for degrees of freedom; this is a more conservative test of significance (Shannon & Davenport, 2000). Post-hoc means comparisons were performed using the Bonferroni Adjustment.

All of the ANOVAs performed yielded significant results. See Table 32 for a list of the means and standard deviations for each subscale, Table 33 for the F-values and degrees of freedom, and Tables 34-36 for the results of the post-hoc comparisons.

From Table 33 it can be seen that in the immediate time frame, the high severity situation (Drunk Driving) led perpetrators to have high levels of Concern about God, Impression Management Concerns, Victim and Others Concerns, and Relationship Concerns, while in those same areas of concern, the low severity situation (Late Lunch)

Table 32
Means (M) and Standard Deviations (SD) for Motive Subscales

Subscale	Scenario Severity	M	SD
Concern about God Immediately	High	1.65	1.64
	Moderate	1.19	1.58
	Low	1.00	1.55
Concern about God Long-term	High	1.94	1.73
	Moderate	1.30	1.68
	Low	1.10	1.63
Concern about God Time-frames Collapsed	High	1.83	1.65
	Moderate	1.23	1.60
	Low	1.06	1.59
Damaged Self-worth Concerns immediately	High	3.21	1.85
	Moderate	3.17	1.43
	Low	3.48	1.62
Damaged Self-worth Concerns long-term	High	4.89	1.07
	Moderate	4.26	1.29
	Low	3.62	1.65
Damaged Self-worth Concerns time frames collapsed	High	4.10	1.17
	Moderate	3.91	1.16
	Low	3.43	1.42
Justice Concerns immediately	High	4.10	1.55
	Moderate	4.48	1.46
	Low	4.08	1.42
Justice Concerns long-term	High	4.73	1.19
	Moderate	4.60	1.31
	Low	4.06	1.43
Justice Concerns time frames collapsed	High	4.41	1.20
	Moderate	4.55	1.20
	Low	4.10	1.27
Impression Management Concerns immediately	High	4.03	1.75
	Moderate	3.60	1.60
	Low	2.50	1.79

Table 32 Continued

Means (M) and Standard Deviations (SD) for Motive Subscales

Subscale	Scenario Severity	M	SD
Impression Management Concerns long-term	High	4.27	1.48
	Moderate	3.51	1.56
	Low	2.44	1.71
Impression Management Concerns time frames combined	High	4.16	1.45
	Moderate	3.56	1.45
	Low	2.49	1.67
Victim and Others Concerns immediately	High	3.11	1.56
	Moderate	3.13	1.43
	Low	2.62	1.50
Victim and Others Concerns long-term	High	3.63	1.24
	Moderate	3.22	1.29
	Low	2.61	1.42
Victim and Others Concerns time frames collapsed	High	3.38	1.26
	Moderate	3.18	1.26
	Low	2.62	1.38
Relationship Concerns immediately	High	3.40	1.45
	Moderate	3.57	1.21
	Low	3.08	1.39
Relationship Concerns long-term	High	3.82	1.07
	Moderate	3.55	1.11
	Low	3.00	1.32
Relationship Concerns time frames collapsed	High	3.62	1.16
	Moderate	3.56	1.04
	Low	3.06	1.27

Table 33
Significant ANOVA Results for Motive Subscales

Subscale	<u>Immediately</u>		<u>Long-term</u>		<u>Time frames Combined</u>	
	F	df	F	df	F	df
Concern about God	44.15	1.81, 381.55	68.09	1.84, 405.23	65.97	1.86, 409.39
Damaged Self-worth Concerns	4.62*	2, 416	78.04	1.91, 416.60	31.56	1.92, 421.23
Justice Concerns	9.81	2, 422	25.82	2, 418	16.87	2, 438
Impression Management Concerns	75.94	1.90, 404.23	106.2	1.87, 378.47	111.99	1.84, 403.34
Victim and Others Concerns	26.14	2, 422	83.56	1.86, 404.29	58.74	1.91, 415.94
Relationship Concerns	42.02	1.89, 416.72	63.37	1.87, 408.51	42.02	1.89, 416.72

* $p = .010$; all other F -values are significant at $p < .001$.

Table 34
Post-hoc Comparisons: Motive Subscale Differences for the Immediate Time Frame

Subscale	Scenario Severity	Scenario Differs from	Mean Difference	Standard Error
Concern about God	High	Low	.65*	.08
	High	Moderate	.46*	.07
	Moderate	Low	.19**	.06
Damaged Self-worth Concerns	Moderate	Low	.31**	.11
	Moderate	High	.27**	.10
Justice Concerns	Moderate	Low	.40*	.10
	Moderate	High	.38*	.10
Impression Management Concerns	High	Low	1.53*	.14
	High	Moderate	.42**	.11

Table 34 Continued

Post-hoc Comparisons: Motive Subscale Differences for the Immediate Time Frame

Subscale	Scenario Severity	Scenario Differs from	Mean Difference	Standard Error
	Moderate	Low	1.11*	.13
Victim and Others Concerns	High	Low	1.02*	.09
	Moderate	Low	.52*	.08
Relationship Concerns	High	Low	.57*	.07
	Moderate	Low	.51*	.08

* $p < .001$, ** $p < .030$

Table 35

Post-hoc Comparisons: Motive Subscale Differences for the Long-term Time Frame

Subscale	Scenario Severity	Scenario Differs from	Mean Difference	Standard Error
Concern about God	High	Low	.84*	.08
	High	Moderate	.64*	.08
	Moderate	Low	.20**	.06
Damaged Self-worth Concerns	High	Low	.56*	.11
	High	Moderate	.20**	.09
	Moderate	Low	.64*	.11
Justice Concerns	High	Low	.67*	.10
	Moderate	Low	.54**	.11
Impression Management Concerns	High	Low	1.83*	.14
	High	Moderate	.77*	.11
	Moderate	Low	1.06*	.13
Victim and Others Concerns	High	Low	1.02*	.09
	High	Moderate	.41*	.07
	Moderate	Low	.61	.08
Relationship Concerns	High	Low	.82*	.08
	High	Moderate	.29*	.06
	Moderate	Low	.51*	.08

* $p < .001$, ** $p < .036$

Table 36

Post-hoc Comparisons: Motive Subscale Differences for the Time Frames Combined

Subscale	Scenario Severity	Scenario Differs from	Mean Difference	Standard Error
Concern about God	High	Low	.76*	.08
	High	Moderate	.57*	.07
	Moderate	Low	.19**	.06
Damaged Self-worth Concerns	High	Low	.56*	.09
	High	Moderate	.20**	.08
	Moderate	Low	.47*	.09
Justice Concerns	High	Low	.31**	.09
	Moderate	Low	.44*	.09
Impression Management Concerns	High	Low	1.68*	.13
	High	Moderate	.60*	.10
	Moderate	Low	1.08*	.12
Victim and Others Concerns	High	Low	.75*	.08
	High	Moderate	.20**	.06
	Moderate	Low	.56*	.07
Relationship Concerns	High	Low	.57*	.07
	Moderate	Low	.51*	.07

* $p < .001$, ** $p < .036$

resulted in perpetrators experiencing the least amount of concern. For Damaged Self-worth Concerns and Justice Concerns however, it was the moderate severity situation (Workplace Gossip) that led participants to have the greatest amount of concern.

Furthermore, from Table 35 it can be seen that in the long-term time frame, different from the immediate time frame concerns, Justice Concerns were highest in the high severity scenario (as opposed to the moderate severity scenario for the immediate time frame). As with the long-term time frame, results for the two time frames collapsed

suggest that the high severity situation evokes the greatest amount of concern for each area except for the Justice Concerns, which are more activated by the moderate severity situation.

Behavioural Differences within Scenarios

In order to determine if participants engaged in different modes of forgiveness-seeking behaviours depending on the severity of the situation, a series of Repeated Measures ANOVAs were conducted. An ANOVA was conducted for each subscale for the immediate time frame, the long-term time frame and the two time frames combined. In these ANOVAs, whenever the sphericity assumption, which tests for equal covariances between within subject factors (Shannon & Davenport, 2000), was violated, results were interpreted using the Greenhouse-Geisser epsilon; this is a more conservative test of significance (Shannon & Davenport, 2000). Post-hoc mean-comparison analyses were performed using the Bonferroni Adjustment.

All of the ANOVAs performed yielded significant results. See Table 37 for a list of the means and standard deviations for each behaviour subscale, Table 38 for the F-values and degrees of freedom, and Tables 39-41 for the results of the post-hoc comparisons.

Results of the time frames collapsed seemed to echo the results of the immediate time frame analyses as well as the long-term time frame analyses.

Personality (HEXACO) Differences within Scenarios

In order to determine if personality had a role in the differing concerns and the different modes of forgiveness-seeking depending on the severity of the transgression, a

Table 37
Means (M) and Standard Deviations (SD) for Behaviour Subscales

Subscale	Scenario Severity	M	SD
Approach immediately	High	5.06	1.05
	Moderate	4.69	1.25
	Low	5.01	1.05
Approach long-term	High	5.17	.98
	Moderate	4.63	1.14
	Low	4.66	1.36
Approach Time-frames Collapsed	High	5.13	.82
	Moderate	4.66	.97
	Low	4.85	.98
Avoidance immediately	High	2.80	1.46
	Moderate	2.95	1.36
	Low	2.53	1.52
Avoidance long-term	High	3.90	1.17
	Moderate	3.40	1.35
	Low	2.81	1.52
Avoidance time-frames collapsed	High	3.37	1.09
	Moderate	3.20	1.19
	Low	2.68	1.39
Denial and Hiding immediately	High	1.09	1.24
	Moderate	1.69	1.29
	Low	1.49	1.17
Denial and Hiding long-term	High	1.01	1.12
	Moderate	1.46	1.18
	Low	1.34	1.16
Denial and Hiding time frames collapsed	High	1.05	1.09
	Moderate	1.58	1.18
	Low	1.42	1.13
Groveling immediately	High	3.70	1.34
	Moderate	3.08	1.25
	Low	3.09	1.34
Groveling long-term	High	3.69	1.26
	Moderate	2.91	1.21
	Low	2.76	1.40
Groveling time frames collapsed	High	3.70	1.18
	Moderate	3.00	1.13
	Low	2.94	1.29

Table 38
Significant ANOVA Results for Behaviour Subscales

Subscale	<u>Low Severity</u>		<u>Moderate Severity</u>		<u>High Severity</u>	
	F	df	F	df	F	df
Approach	14.26	2, 434	32.50	1.86, 390.39	12.28	2, 438
Avoidance	13.79	1.84, 391.11	99.20	1.92, 415.71	61.20	1.83, 400.29
Denial and Hiding	30.25	2, 428	19.23	2, 424	29.26	2, 438
Groveling	36.84	1.84, 393.88	83.81	1.84, 398.27	71.14	1.85, 404.04

Note: All *F*-values are significant at $p < .001$.

Table 39
Post-hoc Comparisons: Behaviour Subscale Differences for the Immediate Time Frame

Subscale	Scenario Severity	Scenario Differs from	Mean Difference	Standard Error
Approach	High	Moderate	.38*	.08
	Low	Moderate	.33*	.33
Avoidance	High	Low	.27**	.09
	Moderate	Low	.42*	.08
Denial and Hiding	Moderate	High	.60*	.08
	Moderate	Low	.21**	.07
	Low	High	.40*	.08
Groveling	High	Low	.61*	.09
	High	Moderate	.62*	.08

* $p < .001$, ** $p < .002$

Table 40

Post-hoc Comparisons: Behaviour Subscale Differences for the Long-term Time Frame

Subscale	Scenario Severity	Scenario Differs from	Mean Difference	Standard Error
Approach	High	Low	.51*	.08
	High	Moderate	.54*	.06
Avoidance	High	Low	1.09*	.09
	High	Moderate	.50*	.07
	Moderate	Low	.59*	.07
Denial and Hiding	Low	High	.33*	.08
	Moderate	High	.45*	.07
Groveling	High	Low	.93*	.09
	High	Moderate	.78*	.07

* $p < .001$

Table 41

Post-hoc Comparisons: Behaviour Subscale Differences for Time Frames Combined

Subscale	Scenario Severity	Scenario Differs from	Mean Difference	Standard Error
Approach	High	Low	.28*	.06
	High	Moderate	.47*	.06
	Low	Moderate	.20**	.07
Avoidance	High	Low	.69*	.07
	High	Moderate	.18**	.06
	Moderate	Low	.52*	.06
Denial and Hiding	Low	High	.36*	.07
	Moderate	High	.52*	.07
Groveling	High	Low	.76*	.08
	High	Moderate	.70*	.07

* $p < .001$, ** $p = .009$

series of correlation analyses were run on the HEXACO subscales and the forgiveness-seeking motive subscales as well as the behaviour subscales. For the significant results of the analyses with the motivation subscales see Tables 42-47. For the significant results of the analyses with the behaviour subscales see Tables 48-52.

Table 42

Significant Correlations between Honesty-Humility and the Motive Subscales

Subscale	<u>Low Severity</u>			<u>Moderate Severity</u>			<u>High Severity</u>		
	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N
Concern about God long-term							-.15	.028	212

Table 43

Significant Correlations between Emotionality and the Motive Subscales

Subscale	<u>Low Severity</u>			<u>Moderate Severity</u>			<u>High Severity</u>		
	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N
Concern about God immediately							.16	.021	214
Concern about God long-term							.19	.004	220
Concern about God time frames collapsed	.24	<.001	220				.22	.001	220
Damaged Self-worth Concerns immediately	.15	.027	213						
Damaged Self-worth Concerns long-term	.26	<.001	219	.14	.033	220	.26	<.001	219
Impression Management Concerns immediately	.26	<.001	215	.27	<.001	217	.24	<.001	217

Table 43 Continued

Significant Correlations between Emotionality and the Motive Subscales

Subscale	<u>Low Severity</u>			<u>Moderate Severity</u>			<u>High Severity</u>		
	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N
Impression Management Concerns long-term	.24	<.001	220	.2825	<.001	220	.2526	<.001	220
Victim and Other Concerns long-term				.19	.005	218	.17	.012	220
Victim and Other Concerns time frames collapsed				.17	.011	219	.15	.025	220
Relationship Concerns immediately				.22	<.001	217			
Relationship Concerns long-term	.17	.014	219	.23	.001	219			
Relationship Concerns time frames collapsed	.15	.032	220	.24	<.001	220	.18	.009	220

Table 44

Significant Correlations between Extraversion and the Motive Subscales

Subscale	<u>High Severity</u>		
	r	p	N
Damaged Self-worth Concerns long-term	.14	.039	219
Impression Management Concerns immediately	.14	.040	217
Victim and Other Concerns immediately	.15	.030	215

Table 44 Continued

Significant Correlations between Extraversion and the Motive Subscales

Subscale	<u>High Severity</u>		
	r	p	N
Relationship Concerns long-term	.17	.013	219
Relationship Concerns time frames collapsed	.16	.019	220

Table 45

Significant Correlations between Agreeableness and the Motive Subscales

Subscale	<u>Moderate Severity</u>		
	r	p	N
Damaged Self-worth Concerns long-term	.14	.035	220
Damaged Self-worth Concerns time frames collapsed	.13	.047	220
Justice Concerns long-term	.14	.046	215

Table 46

Significant Correlations between Conscientiousness and the Motive Subscales

Subscale	<u>Moderate Severity</u>			<u>High Severity</u>		
	r	p	N	r	p	N
Concern about God immediately				.15	.026	214
Victim and Others Concerns long-term	.14	.034	218			

Table 47

Significant Correlations between Openness to Experience and the Motive Subscales

Subscale	<u>Low Severity</u>			<u>Moderate Severity</u>			<u>High Severity</u>		
	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N
Concern about God immediately	-.20	.003	212	-.28	<.001	213	-.29	<.001	214
Concern about God long-term	-.25	<.001	220	-.29	<.001	220	-.29	<.001	220
Concern about God time frames collapsed	-.23	.001	220	-.28	<.001	220	-.30	<.001	220
Impression Management Concerns immediately	-.14	.044	213	-.21	.002	217	-.17	.013	217
Impression Management Concerns long-term	-.20	.003	209	-.22	.002	212	-.15	.031	212
Impression Management Concerns time frames collapsed	-.19	.005	219	-.22	.001	220	-.17	.013	220
Victim and Other Concerns long-term	-.14	.045	219						
Relationship Concerns long-term	-.17	.011	219	-.23	.001	219	-.18	.009	219
Relationship Concerns time frames collapsed				-.20	.004	220	-.16	.017	220

Table 48

Significant Correlations between Honesty-Humility and the Behaviour Subscales

Subscale	<u>Low Severity</u>			<u>Moderate Severity</u>			<u>High Severity</u>		
	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N
Approach long-term				.13	.05	214			
Approach time frames collapsed				.13	.048	220			
Deny and Hide immediately	-.31	<.001	218	-.32	<.001	216	-.36	<.001	218
Deny and Hide long-term	-.26	<.001	214	-.34	<.001	220	-.32	<.001	216
Deny and Hide time frames collapsed	-.30	<.001	219	-.30	<.001	220	-.37	<.001	220
Groveling immediately							-.16	.019	217
Groveling long-term							-.18	.006	218
Groveling time frames collapsed							-.19	.004	220

Table 49

Significant Correlations between Emotionality and the Behaviour Subscales

Subscale	<u>Low Severity</u>			<u>Moderate Severity</u>			<u>High Severity</u>		
	r	p	N	r	p	N	r	p	N
Approach long-term	.15	.026	211				.15	.025	213
Approach time frames collapsed	.15	.024	219						
Avoidance long-term	.16	.016	218	.15	.026	220	.16	.018	219
Deny and Hide long-term	.14	.045	214						
Deny and Hide time frames collapsed	.14	.040	219						
Groveling immediately	.15	.025	218						
Groveling long-term	.19	.006	218						
Groveling time frames collapsed	.19	.006	219	.14	.042	220	.13	.05	220

Table 50

Significant Correlations between Extraversion and the Behaviour Subscales

Subscale	<u>High Severity</u>		
	r	p	N
Approach long-term	.20	.003	213
Approach time frames collapsed	.15	.028	220

Table 51

Significant Correlations between Agreeableness and the Behaviour Subscales

Subscale	<u>Moderate Severity</u>			<u>High Severity</u>		
	r	p	N	r	p	N
Deny and Hide long-term	-.16	.015	220	-.16	.021	216
Deny and Hide time frames collapsed	-.15	.022	220	-.15	.025	220

Table 52

Significant Correlations between Openness to Experience and the Behaviour Subscales

Subscale	r	<u>Low Severity</u>			<u>Moderate Severity</u>	
		p	N		r	p
Approach long-term					-.14	.044
Deny and Hide long-term	-.15	.025	214			
Groveling long-term	-.17	.013	218		-.15	.028

Results of the correlational analyses with the motivation subscales did suggest that a perpetrator's personality is one of the factors that led him/her to have different concerns not only in different time frames, but also in different situations (i.e., different levels of severity). For instance, Agreeableness was positively correlated with Damaged Self-worth Concerns in the moderate severity situation (see Table 45) while Emotionality was positively correlated with Damaged Self-worth Concerns in all of the situations, for each level of severity (see Table 43).

As was found with the motivation subscales, correlational analyses with the behaviour subscales showed that a perpetrator's personality was one of the factors that led him/her to engage in different forgiveness-seeking behaviours not only in different time frames, but also in different situations (i.e. different levels of severity). For instance, Openness to Experience was negatively correlated with Approach behaviours in the moderate severity situation, while Extraversion negatively correlated to those types of behaviours in the high severity situation.

Needing forgiveness to Move on

After reading each scenario, participants were asked to rank order whom (victim,

others/society, God, self) they would need forgiveness from in order to move on from the situation. Only 179 of the participants answered this question correctly. The remainder either left it blank or did not rank order the items, but rather, sometimes assigned the same rank to all or multiple items. As such, only the data from the 179 participants who correctly answered this question were used in this analysis. Frequency distributions were examined for the rankings in each scenario: High severity (Drunk Driving), moderate severity (Workplace Gossip), and low severity (Late Lunch). Results for the number of participants who rated each item as most important are displayed in Table 53. The mean ranks and standard deviations for each item are displayed in Table 54.

Results indicate that, in this case, severity of the situation did not have a great influence. Rather, it seems that across the board, in order to move on from the situation, perpetrators would most importantly need forgiveness from their victim(s), followed very closely by forgiveness from themselves. Third most important was receiving forgiveness from God. Receiving forgiveness from others and society did not seem to be of any importance.

Table 53

Frequencies for First Place Rankings: "I would need forgiveness from...in order to move on from the situation"

Item	High Severity	Moderate Severity	Low Severity
From Victim	90 (50.3%)	83 (46.4%)	93 (52%)
From Myself	73 (40.6%)	72 (40.2%)	68 (38%)
From God	16 (8.9%)	23 (12.8%)	16 (8.9%)
From Others/Society	0	1 (0.6%)	2 (1.1%)
<i>N</i> = 179			

Table 54

Means and Standard Deviations for Rankings: "I would need forgiveness from...in order to move on from the situation"

Item	High Severity M (SD)	Moderate Severity M (SD)	Low Severity M (SD)
From Victim	1.62 (.70)	1.70 (.76)	1.59 (.68)
From Myself	1.99 (1.00)	1.86 (.87)	1.83 (.78)
From Others/Society	2.96 (.69)	3.07 (.65)	3.09 (.65)
From God	3.43 (.97)	3.37 (1.07)	3.49 (.95)
<i>N</i> = 179			

Discussion

The purpose of this thesis was to design a questionnaire that assesses forgiveness-seeking motives and behaviours. Items for this questionnaire were formulated under the premise that, following the commitment of an offense in the context of a relationship, a perpetrator will be motivated to reduce the damage that has taken place. As the first phase in developing the questionnaire, the primary aim of this thesis was to test a large pool of items and derive reliable subscales. A secondary goal was to explore the validity of these subscales.

Motivation

Emergence of Forgiveness-seeking Motivation Subscales

In forming the initial questionnaire, it was thought that, following the commission of an offense an individual could be concerned about five general domains: Self, Victim, Others/Society, Relationships, and God. Initial factor analyses of all of the items, within and across scenarios, confirmed the existence of these five hypothesized domains.

In creating the questionnaire it was also thought that the length of time since the transgression would affect what was of concern to the perpetrator. As such, participants provided information about whether or not each item would be of concern immediately after the transgression as well as in the longer term (in order to move on from the situation). Correlations between subscale scores for the two time frames revealed a wide range of correlations, thus demonstrating that this was indeed the case. In addition, results of the factor analyses revealed the emergence of factors specific to time frames. In other words, the same items formed different factors depending on which time frame they were

from. Based on this information, all analyses were performed on the time frames separately. In addition to anticipating differences in domain scores for different time frames, it was also thought that within each of the general domains, the following specific types of concern would emerge: Avoidance of punishment, public image, emotional well-being, self-image, sense of fairness/justice, loss of relationship, loss or gain of power, and loss of ability to trust. However, factor analyses within domains revealed that not all of the hypothesized narrower types of concern were present. Instead, the following subscales emerged (the domain is specified first, the subscale follows the colon): Self: Damaged Self-worth; Self: Justice; Self: Impression Management; Relationship: Relationship with Victim; Relationship: Relationship with Others; Victim: Damaged Self-worth; Victim: Emotional Well-being; Others: Emotional Well-being; God: God angered; God: God's Relationship with Others; God: God's Relationship with the Self.

Reliability of the Subscales

In order to examine the reliability of the subscales, Cronbach's alpha, mean inter-item correlations and test re-test correlations were examined. First, by examining inter-item correlations it was possible to reduce the number of items per subscale. Second, by examining correlations between the subscales it was possible to examine which subscales, if any, could be combined. Results revealed that it made sense to collapse the Relationship subscales into one general Relationship Concerns subscale, to collapse the Victim and Others subscales into one general Victim and Others Concerns subscale, and to collapse the three God subscales into one general Concern about God subscale. This resulted in the creation of the following subscales: Concern about God, Damaged Self-

worth Concerns, Justice Concerns, Impression Management Concerns, Victim and Others Concerns, and Relationship Concerns.

Following the emergence of these subscales, reliability analyses were re-run on these new, reduced-item subscales. For the most part, the subscales showed strong internal consistency, with Cronbach's alphas generally ranging from .80 to .98. Two of the subscales, Damaged Self-Worth Concerns and Impression Management Concerns, had alphas lower than .80 in the long-term time frame; however, these were still acceptable: Damaged Self-Worth Concerns had an alpha of .78 and Impression Management Concerns an alpha of .77. For the immediate time frame, these subscales had alphas of .86 and .80 respectively. It is curious that in the long-term these scales were less internally consistent; however, as noted above, wrong-doers seem to have differing concerns depending on the length of time passed since the transgression. It may be that their concerns within these two areas become more differentiated with time so that some aspects of, for example, Impression Management Concerns, trouble them more than others, thus reducing the internal consistency.

In continuing to assess the reliability of the subscales, examination of mean inter-item correlations depicted values that, according to Clark and Watson (1995), fall into the acceptable range of .15 - .50. Finally, to further assess reliability, test re-test correlations between the subscales were examined. Correlations for this analysis ranged from moderate to high (.50 - .91). Given the fact that the majority of participants rated the God items as not being of concern to them, it is not surprising that this is the subscale that had the highest test re-test reliability ($r = .86$); therefore, this is likely an overestimate. Falling

at the lower end of the spectrum were the Justice Concerns and Impression Management Concerns subscales. Perhaps items in the Justice Concerns subscale were too vague (e.g., “I would be concerned with doing what is fair”) and thus participants may have had different ideas about what was right and fair in Session 1 vs. Session 2.

At this point in time I can offer no explanation as to why the Impression Management Concerns subscale had some of the lowest test re-test correlations. Given that this subscale was also flagged as having a slightly lower alpha for the long-term time frame, it may be wise to revise this subscale before the next testing of this questionnaire. In interpreting these test re-test correlations, however, it is important to keep in mind that just over half of the sample chose to complete this second session. In addition, given the extreme length of the questionnaire, participants’ responses for Session 2 may have been less thought out than they were for the first session. Furthermore, although participants were asked to complete it 21 days after filling out Session 1, there was actually a very wide range in the time lapse between Session 1 and Session 2, ranging from 4 - 76 days. Clearly, in any follow-up studies, greater control over the running of the second session will have to be exercised. In addition, the fact that most of the participants had the booklets for both sessions in their possession for the duration of their participation, could have resulted in an inflation of the agreement between responses for both sessions; however, given the fact that the test re-test correlations were not uniformly high, this is unlikely.

Validity of the Subscales

The validity of some of the motive subscales (specifically, the Approach and

Avoidance subscales) was assessed through correlation coefficients between the subscales, as well as correlations of the subscales with the HEXACO personality factors and the BIDR (social desirability). Correlations between subscales ranged from low to quite high, with many being high. Normally, one would expect valid scales have low correlations with each other. However, from the beginning stages of the creation of this questionnaire, it was fully expected that some subscales would be at least moderately correlated. Following an offense, a perpetrator will most likely be concerned about a multitude of things at once. For instance, the highest correlation was between the Victim and Others Concerns subscale and the Relationship Concerns subscale. It makes perfect sense that if a wrong-doer was concerned that the victim would react negatively to the transgression he/she would also be concerned that this could have a negative impact on the quality of their relationship (provided the wrong-doer cared about the relationship). What was particularly interesting about these correlations was that the expectation that subscales from one time frame would correlate most highly with the same subscale in the other time frame was not met. This further supports the importance of measuring immediate and long-term reactions separately. In addition, it raises the question about whether or not individuals actually have differing motives: It may be that perpetrators do not have different areas of concern, but rather, simply have generic concerns about the self, others, and relationships. In line with this reasoning, the factor analyses conducted in this study suggest that while there exist differing areas of concerns, I was not fully successful in measuring them in a way that differentiated them. It may be worthwhile in the next questionnaire, to use some forced-choice items to differentiate between

concerns. Rather than giving participants the opportunity to endorse all of the concern items, this would instead force them to differentiate between different concerns and to choose the concerns most important to them.

Another finding that emerged was differences across situations. This in turn raises questions as to what extent there are dispositional differences in forgiveness-seeking motives in contrast to situational determinants of motivations.

In order to assess divergent validity, each subscale was correlated with the two subscales of the BIDR (Self-deceptive Enhancement and Impression Management), which is a measure of social desirability. Only one significant correlation between the subscales and the BIDR was found, and thus it seems that these subscales are relatively free from bias in the direction of socially desirable responses. The only significant correlation was a negative correlation between the Damaged Self-worth Concerns subscale for the long-term time frame and the Self-deceptive Enhancement subscale. This correlation can be interpreted as evidence for concurrent validity. Specifically, people who are less likely to see themselves in a positive light are more likely, at least in the long-term, to think less of themselves following an offense. This interpretation could be made more confidently if a similar correlation had been observed in the immediate time frame. Therefore, it is possible that it is a spurious correlation due to Type 1 error. Either way, it does not pose a threat to divergent validity.

Unfortunately, the expected correlation between the forgiveness-seeking Impression Management Concerns subscale and the Impression Management subscale of the BIDR was not found. It may be that the two subscales were tapping into different

areas of impression management. The forgiveness-seeking subscale assessed concerns about others being angry and being viewed negatively by others, while the questions from the BIDR subscale seemed to be more about an individual's general tendency to follow the norms of society. However, as noted above, this forgiveness-seeking subscale showed less reliability and this may have been a factor.

The Final Subscales

Examination of the factor analyses, reliability analyses and validity analyses supported the formation of the following subscales, all of which are supported by the literature: Concern about God, Damaged Self-worth Concerns, Justice Concerns, Impression Management Concerns, Victim and Others Concerns, and Relationship Concerns. Factor analyses revealed that these subscales produce a similar structure across domains and time frames. As such, the idea of having specific areas of concern embedded within general domains of concerns was no longer relevant.

Given the appearance of the forgiveness concept in most major religions (Leach & Lark, 2004; McCullough & Witvliet, 2002; Schwan, 1998), the emergence of a Concern about God factor was not entirely surprising. What was unexpected however, was the strength of this factor. As such, the Concern about God factor must be interpreted cautiously. Although there was a range in responses with all possible response items being used, the majority of the sample did not endorse the God items and either left them blank or circled the, "not at all a concern" option. Some wrote comments that their God would not react negatively to anything that they did, while others wrote (quite passionately) that they did not like being asked questions about religion. Clearly most of

this sample was either non-practicing or did not like to ponder religiously toned questions. However, given the role of forgiveness in many religions, it makes sense to retain this subscale for further testing in a more religious-oriented population. Moreover, in such a sample, a more complex factor structure might emerge than did in this sample.

The Damaged Self-worth Concerns subscale was comprised of items from the proposed Emotional Well-being and Self-image types of concern, and thus these were collapsed to form one subscale. The emergence of a Damaged Self-worth Concerns subscale was also no surprise, as research has shown that wrong-doers, following the commission of an offense, are often left feeling guilty (e.g., Kelln & Ellard, 1999), angry at themselves (Stone, 2002), embarrassed (Miller & Tangney, 1994), with a lower sense of self-esteem (Holmgren, 1993; Fincham & Beach, 2001; Stone, 2002), anxious, and depressed (Ross et al., 2004).

Research has also shown that perpetrators have concerns about how others view them given their transgression (e.g., Anderson et al. 1996; Gold & Weiner, 2000; Kelley, 1998). In addition, researchers have found that perpetrators also worry about finding a means to restore balance and justice to the relationship (e.g., Ohbuchi et al., 1989; Sandage & Wiens, 2001). Given these results, the emergence of the Impression Management Concerns and Justice Concerns subscales made sense.

Given that a vast amount of research has demonstrated that following a transgression, victims often experience negative feelings such as anger, disappointment, sorrow (Hughes, 1993; Rusbult et al., 2005), resentment, rage, desire for avoidance (e.g., Enright, 1991), and a loss of self-esteem and self-worth (Baumeister et al. 1998;

Brandsma, 1982; Hodgins & Liebeskind, 2003; Leary & Springer, 1998), finding that perpetrators are concerned about their victims is not surprising. It was also originally thought that while perpetrators could be concerned about their victim(s) they could also be concerned about others in society (i.e., others who were indirectly affected by the transgression). Although a transgression can certainly have an impact on individuals in society who were not direct victims of the offense (Worthington et al., 2005) in this study, it does not seem as if there was a great distinction made over the concern about the victim versus concern for others. Results showed that subscales assessing concerns about victims and concerns about others were all highly correlated, suggesting that they should actually be collapsed together into one larger subscale. It may be that participants simply understood "others" to mean the victim, or, it may be that others who suffer effects of the transgression should also be considered victims.

Finally, whether forgiveness and reconciliation are conceptualized as the same thing (e.g., Girard & Mullet, 1997), or separate, but closely related concepts (e.g., Enright et al., 1998), the literature most definitely speaks to a link between the two. Given past findings and the fact that the transgressions in this study all occurred between two parties in a relationship, it is also no surprise that a Relationship Concerns subscale emerged. However, in the original proposal of this questionnaire, it had been thought that concern for the relationship would be split into concern for a loss of the relationship, concern for a change of balance in the relationship (loss/gain of power) and a concern for a loss of trust in the relationship. Based on the results, it seems that once again, these subscales did not have to be differentiated, and instead, came together into a general concern for the status

of the relationship.

Based on the above results, it may be the case that, following the commission of an offense, wrong-doers are concerned about things that relate to either themselves or to their victim(s). Interestingly, when the concern is centred on the self, the concerns seem to be more specific, forming separate subscales (i.e., Damaged Self-worth Concerns, Justice Concerns, Impression Management Concerns, and Relationship Concerns), whereas when the concern is about other people such as the victim, the concern seems to be lumped into one general factor rather than several more differentiated factors.

The absence of the Avoidance of Punishment concern area was slightly puzzling as much of the literature speaks to the fact that victims often have a desire for revenge (Enright, 1991; Enright, 1996; North, 1987), and thus perpetrators should be expecting it, and perhaps even be anxious about it. In addition, quite a bit of literature mentions avoiding punishment as a means of self-preservation (e.g., Caprara et al., 1992; Fukuno & Ohbuchi, 1998; Ohbuchi et al., 2003). Furthermore, Itoi et al. (1996) found that avoidance of punishment was one of the top motives for seeking-forgiveness. The apparently contradictory results of my study could be due to the fact that some of the items that had been proposed for this subscale were eliminated from all analyses due to missing data. In addition, items designated for this subscale that contained the word “God” loaded onto the Concern about God factor. It may also be that the items proposed for this subscale were too vague and did not actually tap into a perpetrator’s fear of revenge. Perhaps it would be useful to actually have items that ask the perpetrator if he/she would be concerned about the victim exacting some form of revenge. For the next

version of this questionnaire, this subscale should be included, but with the addition of new items.

Forgiveness-seeking Motives and Personality (HEXACO)

As there were few specific hypotheses about what personality traits would be related to which concern subscales, the motive subscales and personality analyses were, for the most part, used as a means of exploration rather than a means of establishing the validity of the scale. Although admittedly, all of the significant correlations between the forgiveness-seeking and the personality subscales were rather low, an interesting trend was observed: Personality seemed to be related to time since the transgression. More specifically, this means that individuals tended to be concerned about different things for different time frames, and what concerned individuals varied with the personality of that individual.

In general, Emotionality showed the strongest pattern of correlation across subscales, particularly in the long-term. For instance, in the long-term, Emotionality was positively correlated with all subscales except Concern about God and Justice Concerns. These results make sense as individuals high in Emotionality are characterized by anxiety and feelings of empathic concern (Lee & Ashton, 2006). In comparison, in the immediate time-frame, Emotionality was only significantly correlated with Impression Management Concerns and Relationship Concerns.

The Openness to Experience trait was also correlated with a number of the forgiveness-seeking subscales, but always in the negative direction. Specifically, in the immediate time frame, those high in this trait had significantly lower scores in the areas

of Concern about God, Impression Management Concerns, and Relationship Concerns. These same significant relationships were present in the long-term, with the addition of a significant negative correlation with the Victim and Others Concerns subscale. Perhaps these results are because those high in Openness to Experience are more likely to be able to foresee a variety of possible paths that situations can take. For instance, they may be more able than others to foresee instances where the victim and others will be able to forgive them or move on from the situation.

No significant correlations were found with any personality traits and the Justice Concerns subscale. It may be that a better predictor of this subscale would be a dispositional measure of justice concerns such as Belief in a Just World.

Behaviours

Emergence of Forgiveness-seeking Behaviour Subscales

In filling out the questionnaire, participants were also asked about what behaviours they would use to address their forgiveness-seeking concerns. It was originally assumed that perpetrators would either engage in approach or avoidance behaviours. Results of the factor analyses instead revealed four factors: Approach, Avoidance, Denial and Hiding, and Groveling.

The majority of the literature on forgiveness-seeking behaviours focuses on approach behaviours such as apologies, excuses, and justifications. Generally, when individuals think about seeking forgiveness, they think about an approach behaviour such as apology. In support of this, Witvlet et al. (2002) found that 85% of their participants

had apologized to the victim of the past transgression they were asked to recall. In the original conception of these items, it was thought that the items relating to denial behaviours would load on to the Avoidance factor, as the denial and hiding items are clearly about shifting the blame from the wrong-doer. The emergence of this subscale is further supported by the fact that Felson and Ribner, (1981) found that 17% of the incarcerated men they had contact with had reacted to accusations by denying their part in the crime. Originally it was also thought that behaviours relating to groveling would load on the Approach factor, as these items seem to be an extreme form of approach behaviours, such as the willingness to do whatever it takes for however long it takes in order to make up for the occurrence of the transgression.

Reliability of the Subscales

In order to assess the reliability of the subscales (Approach, Avoidance, Denial and Hiding, and Groveling), Cronbach's alpha, mean inter-item correlations and test re-test correlations were examined. All four subscales had good internal consistency, with Cronbach's alphas ranging from .84 to .93. Mean inter-item correlations were also acceptable, ranging from .26 to .48. In addition, the test re-test correlations were strong, ranging from .63 to .82.

Validity of the Subscales

Once again, the validity of some of the subscales were assessed through correlations between the subscales, as well as with the BIDR (social desirability) and (for some of the subscales) the HEXACO personality factors. Correlations between subscales

were fairly low, ranging from .22 to .54. The highest correlation was between the Approach and Groveling subscales, which is to be expected.

In terms of correlations with the BIDR, the Approach subscale was slightly but significantly correlated with the BIDR Impression Management subscale in the immediate time frame only ($r = .17$). A correlation of this sort was anticipated as it was thought that some individuals may have felt the need to engage in some sort of approach behaviour, such as an apology, because of a belief that this is what others would expect of them. In addition, the Denial and Hiding subscale was slightly, but significantly, negatively correlated with the Impression Management subscale of the BIDR for both the immediate ($r = -.20$) and long-term time frames ($r = -.16$), and with the Self-deceptive Enhancement subscale for the long-term time frame ($r = -.14$). These findings indicate a small response bias. Specifically, the tendency to admit to shifting blame from oneself to the victim was associated with lower scores on the social desirability measure. However, this was not a great concern because the correlations were quite low.

Forgiveness-seeking Behaviours and Personality (HEXACO)

There were two specific hypotheses in terms of the forgiveness-behaviours. It was predicted, based on the findings of Rourke-Marcheterre (2003), that extraverts would be more likely to engage in approach behaviours. Extroversion was related to Approach behaviours in the long-term, but not in the immediate time frame. These findings are somewhat supportive of Rourke-Marcheterre's (2003) findings that extraverts were more likely than introverts to engage in approach behaviours. However, in contrast to the current findings, Rourke-Marcheterre found immediate reactions to be related to

extraversion. However, Rourke-Marcheterre's findings were based on a forced-choice questionnaire, wherein participants were forced to choose between an approach and an avoidance behaviour. For the next testing of this questionnaire, the inclusion of such forced-choice items (for all of the behaviour subscales) may give a clearer picture of where participants fall in terms of their forgiveness-seeking style.

The second hypothesis was that those high in Honesty-Humility would be more likely to engage in Approach behaviours. This was based on findings that Honesty-Humility is negatively correlated with the trait of Narcissism (Lee & Ashton, 2005). Narcissistic entitlement is associated with self-protective tendencies and has repeatedly been found to be a predictor of unforgiveness (Exline et al., 2004). In addition, researchers often describe humility as the opposite of entitlement (e.g., Tangney, 2000), describing it as the ability to acknowledge the wrongs that one has committed. While those scoring high in Honesty-Humility were not found to be more likely to engage in Approach behaviours, in both the immediate and long-term time frames it was found that the tendency to engage in denial and hiding behaviours was negatively related to Honesty-Humility. If this finding can be replicated, it makes sense that Honesty-Humility would be associated with a greater willingness to take responsibility for one's actions.

There were additional findings with personality that had not been predicted. In the immediate time-frame (collapsed over scenarios), Emotionality was positively correlated with Groveling. This correlation also makes sense as Emotionality might be associated with greater anxiety about transgressions and, therefore, the tendency to do anything to make up for it. After the passage of time (i.e., in the long-term time frame) those high in

Emotionality were significantly more likely to engage in every type of forgiveness-seeking behaviour. Again, this may relate to their higher level of anxiety in the situation and thus they may attempt every action that they can think of in order to rectify the situation.

For both the immediate and long-term time frames, those high in Agreeableness and Conscientiousness were less likely to engage in Denial and Hiding behaviours. In addition, in the long-term time frame, those high in Conscientiousness were more likely to engage in Approach behaviours. In addition, in the long-term time frame, those high in Openness to Experience were less likely to engage in Groveling behaviours. As these correlations are purely exploratory, it is hard to interpret them without further testing. It should first be determined that they can be replicated and are not just due to Type 1 error.

Forgiveness Behaviours and the Link to Motivation

Correlational analyses on the forgiveness-seeking motive subscales and the forgiveness-seeking behaviour subscales revealed a large number of significant, positive correlations ranging from .13 (for Damaged Self-worth Concerns in the long-term time frame with Denying and Hiding behaviours in the immediate time-frame) to .73 (for Damaged Self-worth Concerns in the immediate time frame with Avoidance behaviours in the same time-frame). Examination of which motive subscales correlated the highest with which behaviour subscales revealed that those with Justice Concerns in the immediate time frame were most likely to engage in Approach behaviours in that time frame. In addition, those with Damaged Self-worth Concerns were most likely to engage in Avoidance behaviours in the immediate time-frame. This finding can be viewed as

support of Rourke-Marcheterre's (2003) finding that in certain situations (high severity) individuals immediately tend to turn inwards, thus engaging in Avoidance behaviours. Those experiencing Damaged Self-worth in this time frame may engage in Avoidance behaviours in order to engage in some self-forgiveness before approaching their victim. In a similar vein, those experiencing Damaged Self-worth Concerns in the long-term were also most likely to engage in Avoidance behaviours in that same time frame.

Examination of those with higher Victim and Others Concerns and/or Relationship Concerns in the immediate time frame showed that they were more likely to engage in Avoidance behaviours in that same time-frame. This seems counter-intuitive as one would expect that the perpetrator with these concerns would immediately approach the victim. It may be the case that the wrong-doer avoids the victim at first in order to give him/her some time to "calm down."

Those most likely to engage in Denying and Hiding behaviours in the long-term time frame were most likely to be experiencing Relationship Concerns in that same time frame. This makes sense as these wrong-doers may think that their victim would not want to continue the relationship if he/she knew that the perpetrator had been the one responsible for the transgression.

Examination of the Groveling behaviours showed that those with Justice Concerns, Victim and Others Concerns, and/or Relationship Concerns in the immediate time frame were more likely to engage in groveling behaviours in that same time-frame. These perpetrators may be willing to do whatever the victim desires in order to make him/her feel that justice has been restored, for him/her to feel better, and/or for the

relationship to continue as it was. In addition, those with Justice Concerns, Impression Management Concerns, Victim and Others Concerns, and/or Relationship Concerns in the long-term were more likely to engage in Groveling behaviours in that long-term time frame. The same reasoning as above applies to this time frame. Those with impression management concerns in the long-term may feel that what they have done so far has not completely appeased others' impressions of them, and thus, they are willing to do anything to convey, or, make it appear, that they are genuinely sorry.

Differences due to Severity

Given the goal of replicating the findings of Rourke-Marcheterre (2003), together with the above findings and the preliminary factor analyses that found that situations occasionally emerged as factors in their own right, repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted in order to explore situational differences in motivations and behaviours. In all of the ANOVAs conducted, significant differences between scenarios were found.

In terms of replicating Rourke-Marcheterre's (2003) findings, it was expected that extraversion, in the immediate time frame, would be negatively related to the use of Avoidance behaviours and positively related to a greater tendency to use Approach behaviours. Second, it was hypothesized that these relations would be observed in the low and perhaps moderate severity situations, but not in the high. In the high severity situation it was expected that avoidance behaviours would be the norm and that Extraversion would not be predictive of behaviour.

Severity Differences in Motivation

As would be expected, the general pattern was that for any given concern, there

was a linear relationship between score on the concern subscale and severity of the situation. Specifically, the high severity situation yielded the highest scores, followed by the moderate, and then the low. There were three exceptions to this pattern.

In the immediate time frame, Damaged Self-worth Concerns were higher in the moderate severity situation than in the low or high severity situations. A similar pattern was observed with Justice Concerns. In the immediate time frame, Justice Concerns were higher in the moderate severity situation as compared to the low and high severity situations. In the long-term time frame however, the Justice Concerns were higher in the high and moderate severity situations as compared to the low severity one. Finally, in the immediate time frame, Victim and Others Concerns as well as Relationship Concerns were not significantly different between the high and moderate severity situations. Other than pure conjecture, no explanation can be offered for these findings. Should these same results occur in another study using this questionnaire, they will require further exploration.

Severity Differences in Behaviours

In addition to the findings described above with Approach and Avoidance, in the immediate time frame, Denial and Hiding behaviours were most highly endorsed in the moderate severity situation, followed by the low severity, with the lowest scores obtained in the high severity situation. In the long-term time frame, these behaviours were more highly endorsed in the low and moderate severity situations as compared to the high severity situation. It may be that these behaviours were least likely to be endorsed in the high severity situation because it would be harder to deny or hide what had actually

transpired. In addition, it may be the case that these behaviours are more frequent in the moderate severity situation because, as aforementioned, there is the possibility that a person could avoid being detected as the person who started the rumour.

In both time frames, Groveling behaviours were most frequent in the high severity situation as compared to the other two. This is likely a function of the indebtedness the perpetrator may feel toward the injured person.

Scenario differences Based on Personality (HEXACO)

Given Rourke-Marcheterre's (2003) findings that the relation between extroversion and approach versus avoidance varied as a function of severity of situation, correlations between personality and the forgiveness-seeking subscales were calculated within each situation. Despite considerable variability found in the relations between personality and the subscales, no obvious pattern could be discerned. For example, in Rourke-Marcheterre's study, the correlation between extraversion and approach behavior decreased as severity increased. She interpreted her findings to suggest that in high severity situations, personality became less relevant, with the situation being the overwhelming determinant of motives and behaviour. However, in the present study, sometimes the strongest relations were found in the high severity situation (e.g., between Extraversion and Damaged Self-worth Concerns and also Impression Management Concerns). In short, the pattern of findings was highly idiosyncratic and not readily interpretable. It does suggest, however, that future research should consider the interactions between personality and situation when studying forgiveness seeking.

Limitations of Study and Conclusions

Clearly, much further work is needed in order to establish a reliable and valid measure of forgiveness-seeking motives and behaviours. The greatest limitation that needs to be addressed is the small number of participants in this sample. When doing a factor analysis, a researcher should have at least 300 participants (Clark & Watson, 1995) whereas this study only had 221. It will be important in further testing of this questionnaire to increase participant recruiting efforts.

Another major limitation was the sheer length of this questionnaire. While on average it took participants 2 hours to complete a session, the range varied from 1-6 hours. Given the length of this questionnaire, fatigue most likely affected everyone's answers and likely contributed to the large amount of missing data. In addition, given the length of this questionnaire, it would have been better to have had two studies. The first would have focused on reducing items through factor analyses and analyses of internal consistency. The second would have examined test re-test reliability and validity. Many of those who completed both sessions commented that they were not looking forward to having to complete Session 2 as they were dreading the length of it.

Another limitation that must be addressed in the next testing of this questionnaire is that some participants apparently misunderstood the instructions, answering the questions in both time frames. Specifically, some participants, who circled that an item that was of immediate concern to them left the long-term time frame for that same item blank, and vice-versa. These instructions must be made clearer.

Despite these limitations, I was able to derive a smaller set of items that formed subscales that had good to excellent internal consistency, good test re-test reliability and that were interpretable and consistent with the observations of prior research. Moreover, in terms of validity, these subscales were either not correlated, or only slightly correlated, with social desirability. Furthermore, some noteworthy findings were observed. Clearly, perpetrators experience different motives and engage in different behaviours depending on the amount of time that has passed since the transgression. In addition, differences in motives and behaviours also seemed to arise depending on the severity of the transgression, and perhaps, the idiosyncratic characteristics of the situation. Given these findings, while researchers may want to examine total subscale scores across time frames and situations, such a practice will certainly result in a loss of important differences.

The findings of this study provide preliminary evidence that perpetrators' motivations to seek forgiveness, as well as the behaviours they choose to address their concerns, depend in part on their personality. In addition, there was evidence that personality interacts with situation. However, all of the correlations with personality were relatively low, suggesting that there are other predictors of forgiveness-seeking motivations and behaviours. Furthermore, due to the exploratory nature and large number of analyses, all interpretations of results should be done cautiously.

In the future, researchers not only need to further explore the personality-forgiveness-seeking link, but also need to delve into other factors that have an impact on wrong-doers' forgiveness-seeking motives and behaviours. For instance, one factor that could also contribute is the nature of the relationship with the victim. Furthermore, this

study was a means of examining forgiveness using imaginary scenarios and some participants chose to drop out of the study because they could not imagine themselves in these situations. In addition, some others who did fully complete the questionnaire wrote a comment that they had difficulty imagining themselves in some of the situations. The scenarios had been pilot tested beforehand, but in a sample of undergraduate students. Perhaps it would be fruitful to pilot test some new scenarios in a community sample. In addition, researchers need to examine the link between personality and type of forgiveness-seeking in real-life situations. Another limitation with the use of the scenarios was that not only did they differ in terms of severity, but also in terms of social desirability of the behaviour. A useful way to address this would be to have the same offense, with varying consequences. For example, the drunk driving scenario with high consequences would be paralysis of the victim, with moderate consequences would be the victim having a broken limb and with low consequences would be the victim experiencing the accident, but enduring no physical damage.

Although this study purported that perpetrators may have varying motives for seeking forgiveness, analyses showed moderate to high patterns of intercorrelations. Thus, it may be the case a person has a general tendency to seek forgiveness, and does so for multiple reasons. Furthermore, while this study was an attempt to gain further insight into the mind of the perpetrator who chooses to seek forgiveness, it would be fruitful to expand this line of research into exploring motives to not seek forgiveness. For instance, although perpetrators may realize that they have done wrong, they may justify their actions by viewing themselves as victims of the situation, and thus feel that they do not

need to seek forgiveness from others also hurt by the situation.

For the purposes of this study, forgiveness-seeking was understood to be a motivation to reduce the damage caused by the harm, however, much like with forgiveness-granting, there is no clear-cut definition of seeking forgiveness. Future research should attempt to ascertain what exactly it is that perpetrators are looking for, or expecting, by seeking forgiveness.

This study, as with Rourke-Marcheterre's (2003) study may help to shed some light on the order of occurrence of interpersonal and intrapersonal forgiveness-seeking. It is possible that in avoiding their victim, perpetrators are taking the opportunity to come to terms with what they have done and perhaps work on forgiving themselves. Following this, they may then engage in other types of forgiveness-seeking behaviours that are directed at the victim (e.g., approach behaviours). This order of occurrence in type of forgiveness-seeking may very well be somewhat dependent on personality, severity of the situation, and the motivation for the seeking of forgiveness. The idea that some may engage in self-forgiveness before seeking forgiveness from their victim is contradictory to the claims of Enright (1996), Govier, and Verwoerd (2002), and Snow (1993) who argue that self-forgiveness only occurs when interpersonal forgiveness is not possible. Clearly, before such a claim can be made, further research must be done on why wrongdoers are choosing to avoid their victim, as they may be doing so in order to self-forgive, or in order to give their victim some space, or even to avoid further painful experience.

This study demonstrates that there does exist different modes of forgiveness-seeking that are driven, at least in part, by differing concerns about the situation.

need to seek forgiveness from others also hurt by the situation.

For the purposes of this study, forgiveness-seeking was understood to be a motivation to reduce the damage caused by the harm, however, much like with forgiveness-granting, there is no clear-cut definition of seeking forgiveness. Future research should attempt to ascertain what exactly it is that perpetrators are looking for, or expecting, by seeking forgiveness.

This study, as with Rourke-Marcheterre's (2003) study may help to shed some light on the order of occurrence of interpersonal and intrapersonal forgiveness-seeking. It is possible that in avoiding their victim, perpetrators are taking the opportunity to come to terms with what they have done and perhaps work on forgiving themselves. Following this, they may then engage in other types of forgiveness-seeking behaviours that are directed at the victim (e.g., approach behaviours). This order of occurrence in type of forgiveness-seeking may very well be somewhat dependent on personality, severity of the situation, and the motivation for the seeking of forgiveness. The idea that some may engage in self-forgiveness before seeking forgiveness from their victim is contradictory to the claims of Enright (1996), Govier, and Verwoerd (2002), and Snow (1993) who argue that self-forgiveness only occurs when interpersonal forgiveness is not possible. Clearly, before such a claim can be made, further research must be done on why wrongdoers are choosing to avoid their victim, as they may be doing so in order to self-forgive, or in order to give their victim some space, or even to avoid further painful experience.

This study demonstrates that there does exist different modes of forgiveness-seeking that are driven, at least in part, by differing concerns about the situation.

Although further research is needed to more completely explore both the motives and behaviours involved in forgiveness-seeking, this study reveals that there is much to be researched in this area. Forgiveness-seeking is a means to increasing one's chance of being forgiven, something which is of course beneficial to the victim, but which can also result in joy and relief for perpetrators (Gassin, 1998). It is anticipated that further developments in the topic of forgiveness-seeking will reveal facts that are useful in the building of a model of forgiveness-seeking that is beneficial for victims as well as perpetrators.

References

- Akhtar, S. (2002). Forgiveness: Origins, dynamics, psychopathology, and technical relevance. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 71(2), 175-212.
- Anderson, C. A., Krull, D. S., & Weiner, B. (1996). Explanations: Processes and consequences. In E. T. Higgins, and A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social Psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 271-296).
- Andrews, M. (2000). Forgiveness in context. *Journal of Moral Education*, 29, 75-86.
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2001). A theoretical basis for the major dimensions of personality. *European Journal of Personality*, 15, 327-353.
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2005). Honesty-Humility, the Big Five, and the Five Factor Model. *Journal of Personality*, 73(5), 1321-1352.
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2006). *Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., Perugini, M., Szarota, P., deVries, R. E., DiBlas, L., Boies, S. K., & DeRaad, B. (2004). A six-factor structure of personality-descriptive adjectives: Solutions from psycholexical studies in seven languages. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(2), 356-366.
- Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., & Son, C. (2000). Honesty as the sixth factor of personality: Correlations with machiavellianism, primary psychopathy, and social adroitness. *European Journal of Personality*, 14, 359-368.
- Ashton, M. C., Paunonen, S. V., Helmes, E., & Jackson, D. N. (1998). Kin altruism, reciprocal altruism, and the Big Five personality factors. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 19, 243-255.

- Augsberger, D. W., (1992). Reconciliation: The many faces of forgiveness. In D. W. Ausburger (Ed.), *Conflict mediation across cultures: Pathways and patterns* (pp. 259-287). Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press.
- Barnlund, D. C., & Yoshioka, M. (1990). Apologies: Japanese and American styles. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 14, 193-206.
- Batson, C. D., Klein, T. R., Highberger, L., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). Immorality from empathy-induced Altruism: When compassion and justice conflict. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(6), 1042-1054.
- Baumeister, R. F., Exline, J. J., & Sommer, K. L. (1998). The victim role, grudge theory, and two dimensions of forgiveness. In E. L. Worthington Jr. (Ed.), *Dimensions of forgiveness: Psychological research & theological perspectives* (pp. 79-104). Philadelphia: Templeton Foundation Press.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 497-529.
- Baumeister, R. F., Stillwell, A. M., & Heatherton, T. F. (1994). Guilt: An interpersonal approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115, 243-267.
- Baumeister, R. F., Stillwell, A. M., & Heatherton, T. F. (1995). Personal narratives about guilt: Role in action control and interpersonal relationships. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 17(1 & 2), 173-198.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Tice, D. M. (1990). Anxiety and social exclusion. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 9, 165-195.

- Baures, M. M. (1996). Letting go of bitterness and hate. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 36*(1), 75-90.
- Bazemore, G. (1998). Restorative justice and earned redemption. *American Behavioral Scientist, 41*, 768-813.
- Belicki, K., DeCourville, N., Michalica, K., Stewart, T., & Williams, C. (2003). *What does it mean to forgive?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Hamilton, Ontario.
- Belicki, K., Rourke-Marcheterre, J., & McCarthy, M. (2005). *Potential dangers of empathy and related conundrums.* Paper presented at Women's Perspectives on Forgiveness Conference, Mississauga, Ontario.
- Bennett, M., & Dewberry, C. (1994). I've said I'm sorry, haven't I? A study of the identity implications and constraints that apologies create for their recipients. *Current Psychology, 13*(1), 10-20.
- Benson, C. K. (1992). Forgiveness and the psychotherapeutic process. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 11*(1), 76-81.
- Berecz, J. M. (2001). All that glitters is not gold: Bad forgiveness in counseling and preaching. *Pastoral Psychology, 49*(4), 253-275.
- Bergin, A. E. (1980). Psychotherapy and religious values. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 48*(1), 95-105.
- Berry, J. W., Worthington Jr., E. L., O'Connor, L. E., Parrott III, L., & Wade, N. G. (2005). Forgiveness, vengeful rumination, and affective traits. *Journal of Personality, 73*(1), 183-225.

- Berry, J. W., Worthington Jr., E. L., Parrott III, L., O'Connor, L. E., & Wade, N. G. (2001). Dispositional forgiveness: Development and construct validity of the Transgression Narrative Test of forgiveness (TNTF). *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 1277-1290.
- Bolgar, N. (1990). Coping as a personality process: A prospective study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(3), 525-537.
- Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (2003). More than one way to make an impression: Exploring profiles of impression management. *Journal of Management*, 29(2), 141-160.
- Bonar, C. A. (1989). Personality theories and asking forgiveness. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 8(1), 45-51.
- Bradfield, M., & Aquino, K. (1999). The effects of blame attributions and offender likableness on forgiveness and revenge in the workplace. *Journal of Management*, 25(5), 607-631.
- Brandsma, J. M. (1982). Forgiveness: A dynamic, theological and therapeutic analysis. *Pastoral Psychology*, 31(1), 40-50.
- Byrd O'Brien, T., & DeLongis, A. (1996). The interactional context of problem-emotion- and relationship-focused coping: The role of the Big Five personality factors. *Journal of Personality* 64(4), 774-813.
- Caprara, C. V., Manzi, J., & Perugini, M. (1992). Investigating guilt in relation to emotionality and aggression. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13(5), 519-532.

- Carlsmith, K. M. (in press). *Toward a psychology of punishment: Retribution and utility motives*. New Jersey: Princeton University.
- Carlsmith, K. M., Darley, J. M., & Robinson, P. H. (2002). Why do we punish? Deterrence and just deserts as motives for punishment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(2), 284-299.
- Carson, J. W., Keefe, F. J., Goli, V., Fras, A. M., Lynch, T. R., Thorp, S. R., & Buechler, J. L. (2005). Forgiveness and chronic low back pain: A preliminary study examining the relationship of forgiveness to pain, anger, and psychological distress. *The Journal of Pain*, 6(2), 84-91.
- Cervone, D., & Shoda, Y. (1999). Beyond traits in the study of personality coherence. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8(1), 2-32.
- Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological Assessment*, 7(3), 309-319.
- Coyle, C. T., & Enright, R. D. (1997). Forgiveness intervention with postabortion men. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 65(6), 1042-1046.
- Darby, B. W., & Schlenker, B. R. (1982). Children's reactions to apologies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 742-753.
- Darby, B. W., & Schlenker, B. R. (1989). Children's reactions to transgressions: Effects of the actor's apology, reputation and remorse. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 28, 353-364.
- DeCourville, N., & Belicki, K. (2004). *Subjective experiences of forgiveness and unforgiveness in a community sample*. Paper presented at the annual meeting

- of the Canadian Psychological Association, St. John's, Newfoundland.
- DeCourville, N., Belicki, K., & Green, M. (2005). *Meanings of forgiveness*. Paper presented at Women's Perspectives on Forgiveness Conference, Mississauga, Ontario.
- Dillon, R. S. (2001). Self-forgiveness and self-respect. *Ethics, 112*, 53-83.
- Dreher, R. (2000). Forgive? Forget it. *Men's Health, 15*(5), 54-55.
- Dwyer, S. (1999). Reconciliation for realists. *Ethics & International Affairs, 13*, 81-98.
- Einstein, D., & Lanning, K. (1998). Shame, guilt, ego development, and the Five-Factor Model of personality. *Journal of Personality, 66*(4), 555-582.
- Eisenberg, N. (2000). Emotion, regulation, and moral development. *Annual Review of Psychology, 51*, 665-697.
- Endler, N. S., & Parker, J. D.A. (1990). Multidimensional assessment of coping: A critical evaluation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*(5), 844-854.
- Enright, R. D. (1991). The moral development of forgiveness. In W. M., Kuritnes, & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Handbook of moral behavior and development* (Vol 1., pp. 12-152). Hillside, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Enright, R. D. (2001). *Forgiveness is a choice: A step-by-step process for resolving anger and restoring hope*. Washington: APA Life Tools.
- Enright, R. D., & the Human Development Study Group (1996). Counseling within the forgiveness triad: On forgiving, receiving forgiveness, and self-forgiveness. *Counseling and Values, 40*(2), 107-126.
- Enright, R. D., Eastin, D. L., Golden, S., Sarinopoulos, I., & Freedman, S. (1992).

- Interpersonal forgiveness within the helping professions: An attempt to resolve differences of opinion. *Counseling and Values*, 36(2), 84-103.
- Enright, R. D., Freedman, S., & Rique, J. (1998). The psychology of interpersonal forgiveness. In R. D. Enright & J. North (Eds.), *Exploring forgiveness* (pp. 46-62). Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Enright, R. D., Rique, J., & Coyle, C. T. (2000). *The Enright Forgiveness Inventory (EFI) user's manual*. Madison: The International Forgiveness Institute.
- Enright, R. D., Santos, M. J. D., & Al-Mabuk, R. (1989). The adolescent as forgiver. *Journal of Adolescence*, 12, 95-110.
- Estrada-Hollenbeck, M., & Hetherington, T. F. (1998). Avoiding and alleviating guilt through prosocial behavior. In J. Bybee (Ed.), *Guilt and children* (pp. 215-231). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Exline, J. J., Baumeister, R. F., Bushman, B. J., Campbell, W. K., & Finkel, E. J. (2004). Too proud to let go: Narcissistic entitlement as a barrier to forgiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(6), 894-912.
- Exline, J. J., Worthington Jr., E. L., Hill, P., & McCullough, M. E. (2003). Forgiveness and justice: A research agenda for social and personality psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7(4), 337-348.
- Felson R. B., & Ribner, S. A. (1981). An attributional approach to accounts and sanctions for criminal violence. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 44(2), 137-142.
- Filoiali'i, L. A., & Knowles, L. (1983). The Ifoga: The Samoan practice of seeking forgiveness for criminal behaviour. *Oceania*, 53, 384-389.

- Fincham, F. D. (2000). The kiss of the porcupines: From attributing responsibility to forgiving. *Personal Relationships*, 7, 1-23.
- Fincham, F. D., & Beach, S. R. H. (2001). Forgiving in Close Relationships. In F. H. Columbus & S. P. Shohov (Eds.), *Advances in psychology research* (pp. 163-197). New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- Fincham, F. D., & Kashdan, T. B. (in press). Facilitating forgiveness: Developing group and community interventions. In P. A. Linley & S. Joseph (Eds.), *International handbook of Positive Psychology in practice: From research to application*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Fitness, J. (2001). Betrayal, rejection, revenge, and forgiveness: An interpersonal script approach. In M. R. Leary (Ed.), *Interpersonal rejection* (pp. 73-103): Oxford University Press.
- Flanigan, B. (1998). Forgivers and the unforgiveable. In R. D. Enright & J. North (Eds.), *Exploring forgiveness* (pp. 95-105). Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Folkes, V. S., & Whang, Y-O. (2003). Account-giving for a corporate transgression influences moral judgement: When those who "spin" condone harm-doing. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(1), 79-86.
- Fow, N. R. (1996). The phenomenology of forgiveness and reconciliation. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, 27(2), 219-233.
- Freedman, S. R., & Enright, R. D. (1996). Forgiveness as an intervention goal with incest survivors. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 64(5), 983-992.
- Fukuno, M., & Ohbuchi, K.-I. (1998). How effective are different accounts of harm-

doing in softening victims' reactions? A scenario investigation of the effects of severity, relationship, and culture. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 1, 167-178.

Gassin, E. A. (1998). Receiving forgiveness as moral education: A theoretical analysis and initial empirical investigation. *Journal of Moral Education*, 27(1), 71-87.

Girard, M., & Mullet, E. (1997). Forgiveness in adolescents, young, middle-aged, and older adults. *Journal of Adult Development*, 4(4), 209-220.

Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in public: Microstudies of the public order*. New York: Harper & Row.

Gold, G. J., & Weiner, B. (2000). Remorse, confession, group identity, and expectancies about repeating a transgression. *Basic and Applied Psychology*, 22, 291-300.

Gonzales, M. H., Manning, D. J., & Haugen, J. A. (1992). Explaining our sins: Factors influencing offender accounts and anticipated victim responses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62(6), 958-971.

Gonzales, M. H., Pederson, J. H., Manning, D. J., & Wetter, D. W. (1990). Pardon my gaffe: Effects of sex, status and consequence severity on accounts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(4), 610-621.

Goodwin, C., & Ross, I. (1992). Consumer responses to service failures: Influence of procedural and interactional fairness perceptions. *Journal of Business Research*, 25, 149-163.

Govier, T. (1998). *Dilemmas of trust*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Govier, T., & Verwoerd, W. (2002). Forgiveness: The victim's prerogative. *South African*

- Journal of Philosophy*, 21(1), 97-111.
- Hall, J. H., & Fincham, F. D. (2005). Self-forgiveness: The stepchild of forgiveness research. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 24(5), 621-637.
- Hall, C. S., & Lindzey, G. (1978). *Theories of personality* (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Halling, S. (1994). Shame and Forgiveness. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, 22, 74-86.
- Hamilton, V. L., & Hagiwara, S. (1992). Roles, responsibility, and accounts across cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27(2), 157-179.
- Hargrave, T. D. (1994). Families and forgiveness: A theoretical and therapeutic framework. *The Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families*, 2(4), 339-348.
- Hargrave, T. D., & Sells, J. N. (1997). The development of a forgiveness scale. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 23(1), 41-62.
- Harrar, S. (2002). How grudges hurt you. *Prevention*, 54(2), 38-39.
- Higgins, R. L. (2002). Reality negotiation. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez. *Handbook of Positive Psychology*, (pp. 351-365). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hodgins, H. S., & Liebeskind, E. (2003). Apology versus defense: Antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 39, 297-316.
- Hodgins, H. S., Liebeskind, E., & Schwartz, W. (1996). Getting out of hot water: Facework in social predicaments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(2), 300-314.
- Hogan, R., & Emler, N. P. (1981). Retributive justice. In Lerner, M. J., & Lerner, S. C.,

- The justice motive in social behavior*, (pp. 125-144). New York: Plenum Press.
- Holeman, V. T. (2003). Marital reconciliation: A long and winding road. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 22(1), 30-42.
- Holeman, V. T. (2004). *Reconcilable differences: Hope and healing for troubled marriages*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
- Holmgren, M. R. (1993). Forgiveness and the intrinsic value of persons. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 30, 341-352.
- Holmgren, M. R. (1998). Self-forgiveness and responsible moral agency. *The Journal of Value Inquiry*, 32, 75-91.
- Hope, D. (1987). The healing paradox of forgiveness. *Psychotherapy*, 24, 240-244.
- Hughes, P. M. (1993). What is involved in forgiving? *The Journal of Value Inquiry*, 27, 331-340.
- Idler, E. L., Musick, M. A., Ellison, C. G., George, L. K., Krause, N., Ory, M. G., Pargament, K., Powell, L. H., Underwood, L. G., & Williams, D. R. (2003). Measuring multiple dimensions of religion and spirituality for health research. *Research on Aging*, 24(4), 327-365.
- Itoi, R., Ohbuchi, K-I., & Fukuno, M. (1996). A cross-cultural study of preference of accounts: Relationship closeness, harm severity, and motives of account making. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 26(10), 913-934.
- Jackson, D. N., Ashton, M. C., & Tomes, J. L. (1996). The six-factor model of personality: Facets from the Big Five. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 21(3), 391-402.

- Johnstone, G. (1999). Restorative justice, shame and forgiveness. *Liverpool Law Review*, 21, 197-216.
- Kanz, J. E. (2000). How Do People Conceptualize and Use Forgiveness? The Forgiveness Attitudes Questionnaire. *Counseling & Values*, 44(3), 174-188.
- Karp, D. R. (1998). The judicial and judicious use of shame penalties. *Crime & Delinquency*, 44(2), 277-294.
- Karremans, J. C., Van Lange, P. A. M., Ouwerkerk, J. W., & Kluwer, E. S. (2003). When forgiving enhances psychological well-being: The role of interpersonal commitment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(5), 1011-1026.
- Karremans, J. C., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2004). Back to caring after being hurt: The role of forgiveness. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 34, 207-227.
- Kearns, J. N., & Fincham, F. D. (2005). Victim and perpetrator accounts of interpersonal transgressions: Self-serving or relationship-serving biases? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(3), 321-333.
- Kelley, D. (1998). The communication of forgiveness. *Communication Studies*, 49, 255-271.
- Kelln, B. R. C., & Ellard, J. H. (1999). An equity theory analysis of the impact of forgiveness and retribution on transgressor compliance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(7), 864-872.
- Konstam, V., Chernoff, M., & Deveney, S. (2001). Toward forgiveness: The role of shame, guilt, anger, and empathy. *Counseling and Values*, 46, 26-39.
- Kubany, E. S., & Watson, B. (2003). Guilt: Elaboration of a multidimensional model. *The Psychological Record*, 53, 51-90.

- Lawler, K. A., Younger, J. W., Piferi, R. L., Billington, E., Jobe, R., Edmondson, K., & Jones, W. H. (2003). A change of heart: Cardiovascular correlates of forgiveness in response to interpersonal conflict. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 26*(5), 373-393.
- Lawler, K. A., Younger, J. W., Piferi, R. L., Jobe, R. L., Edmondson, K. A., & Jones, W. H. (2005). The unique effects of forgiveness on health: An exploration of pathways. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 28*(2), 157-167.
- Leach, M. M., & Lark, R. (2004). Does spirituality add to personality in the study of trait forgiveness? *Personality and Individual Differences, 37*, 147-156.
- Leary, M. R., & Springer, C. (1998). The causes, phenomenology, and consequences of hurt feelings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(5), 1225-1237.
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2004). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO personality inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 39*(2), 329-358.
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2006). Further assessment of the HEXACO personality inventory: Two new facet scales and an observer report form. *Psychological Assessment, 18*(2), 182-191.
- Lee, K., Ogunfowora, B., & Ashton, M. C. (2005). Personality traits beyond the Big Five: Are they within the HEXACO space? *Journal of Personality, 73*(5), 143-1463.
- Leith, K. P., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Empathy, Shame, Guilt, and Narratives of Interpersonal Conflicts: Guilt-Prone People Are Better at Perspective Taking. *Journal of Personality, 66*(1), 1-37.
- Loewen J. A. (1970). The social context of guilt and forgiveness. *Practical*

Anthropology, 17, 80-96.

Maher, B. A., & Gottesman, I. I. (2005). Deconstructing, reconstructing, preserving Paul E. Meehl's legacy of construct validity. *Psychological Assessment*, 17(4), 415-422.

Malcom, W., & Waldorsky, C. (2005). *Restoring power and connection through forgiveness and reconciliation*. Presented at Women's Perspective on Forgiveness Conference, Mississauga, Ontario.

McCullough, M. E. (2000). Forgiveness as human strength: Theory, measurement, and links to well-being. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 19, 43-55.

McCullough, M. E. (2001). Forgiveness: Who does it and how to they do it? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 10(6), 194-197.

McCullough, M. E., Pargament, K. I., & Thorsesen, C. E. (2000). The psychology of forgiveness: History, conceptual issues, and overview. In McCullough, M. E., Pargament, K. I., & Thorsen, C. E. (Eds.), *Forgiveness: Theory, research and practice*, (pp. 1-14). NY: Guilford Press.

McCullough, M. E., Rachal, K. C., Sandage, S. J., Worthington Jr., E. L., Brown, S. W., & Hight, T. L. (1998). Interpersonal forgiving in close relationships: II. Theoretical elaboration and measurement. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 75(6), 1586-1603.

McCullough, M. E., & Witvliet, C. V. O. (2002). The psychology of forgiveness. In C. R. Snyder, & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology* (pp. 446-458). Oxford: University Press.

- McCullough, M. E., & Worthington Jr., E. L. (1994). Encouraging clients to forgive those who have hurt them Review, critique and research prospectus. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 22(1), 3-20.
- McCullough, M. E., & Worthington Jr., E. L. (1995). Promoting forgiveness: A comparison of two brief psychoeducational group interventions with a waiting-list control. *Counseling and Values*, 40(1), 55-68.
- McCullough, M. E., & Worthington Jr., E. L. (1999). Religion and the forgiving personality. *Journal of Personality*, 67(6), 1141-1164.
- McCullough, M. E., Worthington Jr., E. L., & Rachal, K. C. (1997). Interpersonal forgiving in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(2), 321-336.
- Miller, D. T. (2001). Disrespect and the experience of injustice. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 527-553.
- Miller, R. S., & Tangney, J. P. (1994). Differentiating embarrassment and shame. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 13(3), 273-287.
- Mills, J. K. (1995). On self-forgiveness and moral self-representation. *The Journal of Value Inquiry*, 29, 405-406.
- Mitchell, C. E. (1989). Effects of apology on marital and family relationships. *Family Therapy*, 16(3), 283-287.
- Mullet, E., Neto, F., Rivière, S. (2005). Personality and its effects on resentment, revenge, forgiveness, and self-forgiveness. In E. L. Worthington Jr. (Ed.), *Handbook of Forgiveness* (pp. 159-181). New York: Routledge Press.

- Murray, R. J. (2002). Forgiveness as a therapeutic option. *The Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families*, 10(3), 315-321.
- Neblett, W. R. (1974). Forgiveness and ideals. *Mind*, 83(330), 269-275.
- North, J. (1987). Wrongdoing and forgiveness. *Philosophy* (62), 499-508.
- North, J. (1998). The "ideal" of forgiveness: A philosopher's exploration. In R. D. Enright & J. North (Eds.), *Exploring forgiveness* (pp. 15-34). Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- O'Brien, T. B., & DeLongis, A. (1996). The interactional context of problem-emotion-, and relationship-focused coping: The role of the Big Five personality factors. *Journal of Personality*, 64(4), 774-813.
- Ohbuchi, K-I., Kameda, M., & Agarie, N. (1989). Apology as aggression control: Its role in mediating appraisal and response to harm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 219-227.
- Ohbuchi, K-I., & Suzuki, M., & Takaku, S. (2003). Strategicness/Authenticity of accounts and their instrumental/non-instrumental variables: A cross-cultural examination. *Tohoku Psychologica Folia*, 62, 57-74.
- Ohbuchi, K-I., & Takada, N. (2001). Escalation of conflict and forgiveness: A social psychological model of forgiveness. *Tohoku Psychologica Folia*, 60, 61-71.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1988). Self-deception and impression management in test responses. In A. Angleitner & J. S. Wiggins (Eds), *Personality assessment via questionnaire* (pp. 142-165). New York: Springer.
- Pope, S. J. (2000). Can one forgive a child molester? *America*, 183(16), 17-20.

- Regehr, C., & Gutheil, T. (2002). Apology, justice and trauma recovery. *The Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 30(3), 425-430.
- Rhoads Meek, K., Albright, J. S., & McMinn, M. R. (1995). Religious orientation, guilt, confession, and forgiveness. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 23(3), 190-197.
- Ross, S. R., Kendall, A. C., Matters, K. G., Wrobel, T. A., & Rye, M. S. (2004). A personological examination of self- and other-forgiveness in the five factor model. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 82(2), 207-214.
- Rourke-Marcheterre, J. (2003). *The role of personality in reactions to hurtful situations*. Unpublished undergraduate thesis, Brock University, St. Catharines, Ontario, Canada.
- Rusbult, C. E., Hannon, P. A., Stocker, S. L., & Finkel, E. J. (2005). Forgiveness and relational repair. In E. L. Worthington Jr. (Ed.), *Handbook of forgiveness*, (pp. 185-205). New York: Routledge.
- Rye, M. S., Loiacono, D. M., Folck, C. D., Olszewski, B. T., Heim, T. A., & Madia, B. P. (2001). Evaluation of the psychometric properties of two forgiveness scales. *Current Psychology*, 20, 260-277.
- Sandage, S. J., & Wiens, T. W. (2001). Contextualizing models of humility and forgiveness: A reply to Gassin. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 29(3), 201-211.
- Sandage, S. J., Worthington Jr., E. L., Hight, T. L., & Berry, J. W. (2000). Seeking forgiveness: Theoretical context and an initial empirical study. *Journal of*

- Psychology*, 28(1), 21-35.
- Scher, S. J., & Darley, J. M. (1997). How effective are the things people say to apologize? Effects of the realization of the apology speech act. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 26, 127-140.
- Schlenker, B. R. (1980). *Impression management: The self-concept, social identity, and interpersonal relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.
- Schlenker, B. R., & Darby, B. W. (1981). The use of apologies in social predicaments. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 44(3), 271-278.
- Schmitt, M., Gollwitzer, M., Förster, N., & Montada, L. (2004). Effects of objective and subjective account components on forgiving. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 144(5), 465-485.
- Schmitt, M., Gollwitzer, M., Maes, J., & Arbach, D. (2005). Justice sensitivity: Assessment and location in the personality space. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 21(3), 2002-211.
- Schneider, C. D. (2000). What it means to be sorry: The power of apology in mediation. *Mediation Quarterly*, 17(3), 265-280.
- Schwan, G. (1998). The "healing" value of truth-telling: chances and social conditions in a secularized world. *Social Research*, 65(2), 725-740.
- Scobie, E. D., & Scobie, G. E. W. (1998). Damaging events: The perceived need for forgiveness. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 28, 373-401.
- Scobie, G. E. W., & Scobie, E. D. (2002). An analysis of the components of forgiveness. *Journal of Beliefs & Values*, 23(1), 83-99.

- Semin, G. R., & Manstead, A. S. P. (1983). *The accountability of conduct: A social psychological analysis*. New York Academic Press Inc.
- Seybold, K. S., Hill, P., Neumann, J. K., & Chi, D. S. (2001). Physiological and psychological correlates of forgiveness. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 20(3), 250-259.
- Shannon, D. M., & Davenport, M. A. (2000). *Using SPSS to solve statistical problems: A self-instruction guide*. New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Silverman, L. J., Rivera, A. N., & Tedeschi, J. T. (1979). Transgression-compliance: Guilt, negative affect, or impression management? *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 108, 57-62.
- Snow, N. E. (1993). Self-forgiveness. *The Journal of Value Inquiry*, 37, 75-80.
- Steiner, C. (2000). Apology: The transactional analysis of a fundamental exchange. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 30(2), 145-149.
- Stone, M. (2002). Forgiveness in the workplace. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 34(7), 278-286.
- Taft, L. (2000). Apology subverted: The commodification of apology. *The Yale Law Journal*, 109, 1135-1160.
- Takada, N., & Ohbuchi, K.-I. (2004). Why do we forgive offenders? Egocentric, altruistic, and normative motives for interpersonal forgiveness. *Tohoku Psychologica Folia*, 63, 95-102.
- Takahashi, A., & Ohbuchi, K.-I. (1998). Acceptance and rejection of responsibility by account making, instrumental and non-instrumental concerns, and mitigating

- circumstances. *Tohoku Psychologica Folia*, 57, 46-57.
- Takaku, S. (2000). Culture and status as influences on account giving: A comparison between the United States and Japan. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30(2), 371-388.
- Takaku, S. (2001). The effects of apology and perspective taking on interpersonal forgiveness: A dissonance-attribution model of interpersonal forgiveness. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 141, 494-508.
- Takaku, S., Weiner, B., & Ohbuchi, K-I (2001). A cross-cultural examination of the effects of apology and perspective taking on forgiveness. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 20(1 & 2), 144-166.
- Tangney, J. P. (1995). Recent advances in the empirical study of shame and guilt. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 38(8), 1132-1145.
- Tangney, J. P., Boone, A. L., & Dearing, R. (2005). Forgiving the self: Conceptual issues and empirical findings. In E. L. Worthington JR., (Ed.), *Handbook of forgiveness*, (pp. 143-158). New York: Routledge.
- Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P. E., Hill-Barlow, D., Marschall, D. E., & Gramzow, R. (1996). Relation of shame and guilt to constructive versus destructive responses to anger across the lifespan. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(4), 797-809.
- Thompson, L. Y., & Snyder, C. R. (2004). Measuring forgiveness. In S. J. Lopez & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *Positive psychological assessment: A handbook of models and measures* (pp. 301-312). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Thompson, L. Y., Snyder, C. R., Hoffman, L., Michael, S. T., Rasmussen, H. N.,

- Billings, L. H., Neufeld, J. E., Shorey, H. S., Roberts, J. C., & Roberts, D., E. (2005). Dispositional forgiveness of self, others and situations. *Journal of Personality, 73*(2), 313-360.
- Todd, E. (1985). The value of confession and forgiveness according to Jung. *Journal of Religion and Health, 24*(1), 39-48.
- Tomlin, E. C., Dineen, B. R., & Lewicki, R. J. (2003). The road to reconciliation: Antecedents of victim willingness to reconcile following a broken promise. *Journal of Management, 30*(2), 165-187.
- Tutu, D. M. (1999). *No future without forgiveness*. New York: Doubleday.
- Veenstra, G. (1992). Psychological concepts of forgiveness. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 11*(2), 160-169.
- Walker, D. F., & Gorsuch, R. L. (2002). Forgiveness within the Big Five personality model. *Personality and Individual Differences, 32*, 1127-1137.
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1992). On traits and temperament: General and specific factors of emotional experience and their relation to the five factor model. *Journal of Personality: Special Issue: The five-factor model, issues and applications, 60*(2), 441-476.
- White, J. K., Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (2004). Big five personality variables and relationship constructs. *Personality and Individual Differences, 37*, 1519-1530.
- Witvliet, C. V. (2001). Forgiveness and health: Review and reflections on a matter of faith, feelings, and physiology. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 29*(3), 212-224.

- Witvliet, C. V. O., Ludwig, T. E., & Bauer, D. J. (2002). Please forgive me: Transgressors' emotions and physiology during imagery of seeking forgiveness and victim responses. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 21(3), 219-233.
- Worthington Jr., E. L. (1998). An empathy-humility-commitment model of forgiveness applied within family dyads. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 20, 59-76.
- Worthington Jr., E. L. (2000). Is there a place for forgiveness in the justice system? *Fordham Urban Law Journal*, 27, 1721-1734.
- Worthington Jr., E. L. (2001). Unforgiveness, forgiveness, and reconciliation and their implications for societal interventions. In R. G. Helmick & R. L. Petersen (Eds.), *Forgiveness and reconciliation: Religion, public policy, & conflict transformation* (pp. 161-182). Philadelphia: Templeton Foundation Press.
- Worthington, E. L., Jr., Berry, J. W., & Parrott, L., III. (2001). Unforgiveness, forgiveness, religion, and health. In T. G. Plante & A. C. Sherman (Eds.), *Faith and health: Psychological perspectives* (pp. 107-138). New York: Guilford
- Worthington Jr., E. L., & Drinkard, D. T. (2000). Promoting reconciliation through psychoeducational and therapeutic interventions. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 26(1), 93-101.
- Worthington Jr., E. L., Mazzeo, S. E., & Kliever, W. L. (2002). Addictive and eating disorders, unforgiveness and forgiveness. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 21(3), 257-261.
- Worthington Jr., E. L., & Wade, N. G. (1999). The psychology of unforgiveness and forgiveness and implications for clinical practice. *Journal of Social and Clinical*

Psychology, 18, 385-418.

Worthington Jr., E. L., Witvliet C. V. O., Lerner, A. J., & Scherer, M. (2005).

Forgiveness in health research and medical practice. *Explore* 1, 169-176.

APPENDIX A

STUDY 1 SCENARIOS

HIGH SEVERITY

Cheating

You go to a party one night, get really drunk and end up cheating on your partner. This one-night stand means absolutely nothing to you and you don't plan on telling your partner anything about it. Unfortunately, one of your partner's friends was also at this party and ends up telling your partner the whole story. As a result, you and your partner end up in a big fight.

Drunk Driving

You're at a party and you've had a few drinks, but you feel fine, so you get behind the wheel to drive you and your best friend home. On the way home, you lose control of the car and crash into a tree. You and your friend are taken to the hospital. You have a broken leg and arm: your friend will never walk again.

Babysitting

You are babysitting the 3 year old child of a good friend of the family's. Around 7:00pm, you find yourself bored with watching Barney, so you leave the child sitting quietly watching the television and you go and give your friend a call. After 15 minutes of chitchatting on the phone, you return to the family room where you'd left the child, and find that the child is no longer there. You search the main floor and discover that while you were on the phone with your friend, the child had wandered into the kitchen and drank cleaning fluid. You call 911 and the child is rushed to the hospital.

MODERATE SEVERITY

Workplace Gossip

You and your best friend have been working for the same company for the same amount of time. Through the grapevine you hear that your friend has been offered a promotion. You are happy for your friend but you are also disappointed that you were not offered the same opportunity. You vent your frustrations to some of your other co-workers and, not intending to, disclose some unsavory information about your friend. To your dismay, your boss gets wind of this information and your best friend loses the promotion.

Movie

School has been keeping you really busy lately and you haven't been spending much time with your friends. Your best friend is feeling neglected and so you promise you'll spend Saturday night with them. Saturday afternoon, the person you have a crush on asks you to the movies. You call your best friend and ask if you can rain check on your evening together because you're not feeling well and just want to go to bed. Your best friend sounds disappointed but understands. Later that night, while at the movies with your crush, you run into your best friend sitting alone in the theatre.

Tell Secret

Your best friend tells you in confidence that they've cheated on their partner. Although you know you shouldn't break your friend's confidence, this is too juicy a secret to keep to yourself. You only tell one other person, but the secret quickly spreads. Because you betrayed your best friend's confidence, their relationship with their partner is now over.

LOW SEVERITY

Late Lunch

You are supposed to meet your good friend for lunch in ten minutes, but as you are hurrying towards your car, you happen to run into someone that you haven't seen in a really long time. You of course stop to say hello and see how they've been. You realize that if you don't leave right now you're going to be late meeting your friend, but you're really excited to be talking to this person right now, so you decide to stick around and finish catching up. Half an hour later the two of you finally part ways. When you get into your car, you turn on your cell phone and find that there is a message from your friend. You can tell by your friend's voice that they are quite upset, and their message says that they got tired of waiting for you to show up and so they've left the restaurant.

Embarrassment

During dinner at a casual gathering at a friend's house, things start getting silly. To join in on the fun, you tell a particularly embarrassing story about your best friend, who is also at this dinner. Your best friend usually has a great sense of humour, but this was a particularly embarrassing situation and you know you probably shouldn't have told it. Your best friend is humiliated and runs out of the dining room.

Stolen Lunch

It's 2:00pm, and there's still 3 hours left until you're done work. It's been such a crazy day that you never even had time for a lunch break. You've only got 20 minutes until your next meeting, which is just enough time to grab a quick bit. You're starving but didn't bring a lunch and you don't have time to go out and buy one. On a whim, you open the communal bar fridge to see if there's an apple or some other item that someone has left behind. The only thing that's in the fridge is a pizza box with 4 slices of pizza in it. You realize that this could potentially be someone's lunch, but it's the middle of the afternoon, so chances are, this is just someone's leftovers. Before you know it, you've eaten 3 of the 4 pieces. Just as you're cleaning up from your lunch, one of your co-workers walks in and mentions what a crazy day they've been having and how they just now finally have a chance to eat their lunch. They go on to tell you that they brought this great pizza that they had for dinner last night and ask you if you'd like to join them and have a slice. As they are saying this to you, they open the fridge and discover that they only have one slice of pizza left. Your co-worker is extremely upset because they've been looking forward to their lunch all day, and now they barely have any of it left and as they too have a meeting in a few minutes, they do not have the time to go out and buy anything else to eat.

Library

You're working on an essay that's due in a couple of days but you run into a huge problem: all the books on that topic have been signed out of the library. The friend you're complaining about this to mentions that they actually have one of those books signed out and that they're done with it and you're more than welcome to take it. As they're giving it to you, your friend mentions that the book is due back to the library in 3 days and asks you to bring it back by then. The next few days are busy ones and the fact that you have to return the book totally slips your mind. When you finally remember to return the book it is over a week late. You don't have any cash on you to pay the late fine and the bank machine is nowhere near the library and you really don't feel like walking all the way over to it, so you just slip the book into the return hatch. A few days later your friend calls you upset because they went to borrow another book from the library but weren't allowed because they didn't have any money and couldn't pay their late fine for the book that you borrowed.

Snap at Friend

You've had a really rotten day, just one of those days where absolutely everything goes wrong. All you want to do is sit at home by yourself and watch a movie and have nothing to do with anybody else. Just as you're sitting down to start your movie, your good friend calls you upset again over some date that didn't go well. As your friend goes on and on about their romantic problems, which seem so insignificant after all the problems you dealt with today, you finally just can't take it anymore and yell at them that there are worse things in life to have happen than a bad date and they need to stop being so shallow and self-centered. Your friend gets very quiet and then, obviously upset, say they're sorry to have bothered you and hang up.

APPENDIX B

Please read the following eleven scenarios and answer the questions that follow them. Imagine that you are the perpetrator in each of the situations. After you have read ALL of the scenarios, please rank them in order of severity, from 1 (least severe) to 11 (most severe).

Scenario 1

Scenario 2

1 2 3 4 5
(not at all) (very)

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

1 2 3 4 5
(not at all) (very)

You are supposed to meet your good friend for lunch in ten minutes, but as you are hurrying towards your car, you happen to run into someone that you haven't seen in a really long time. You of course stop to say hello and see how they've been. You realize that if you don't leave right now you're going to be late meeting your friend, but you're really excited to be talking to this person right now, so you decide to stick around and finish catching up. Half an hour later the two of you finally part ways. When you get into your car, you turn on your cell phone and find that there is a message from your friend. You can tell by your friend's voice that they are quite upset, and their message says that they got tired of waiting for you to show up and so they've left the restaurant.

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

1 2 3 4 5
(not at all) (very)

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

1 2 3 4 5
(not at all) (very)

During dinner at a casual gathering at a friend's house, things start getting silly. To join in on the fun, you tell a particularly embarrassing story about your best friend, who is also at this dinner. Your best friend usually has a great sense of humour, but this was a particularly embarrassing situation and you know you probably shouldn't have told it. Your best friend is humiliated and runs out of the dining room.

1 2 3 4 5
(not at all) (very)

1 2 3 4 5
(not at all) (very)

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

1 2 3 4 5
(not at all) (very)

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

1 2 3 4 5
(not at all) (very)

How well were you able to imagine yourself in the above scenario?

How guilty would you feel if you were actually in this situation?

How realistic did you find the above scenario?

How ashamed would you feel if you were actually in this situation?

How awful would you feel if you were actually in this situation?

How responsible would you feel if you were actually in this situation?

It's 2:00pm, and there's still 3 hours left until you're done work. It's been such a crazy day that you never even had time for a lunch break. You've only got 20 minutes until your next meeting, which is just enough time to grab a quick bit. You're starving but didn't bring a lunch and you don't have time to go out and buy one. On a whim, you open the communal bar fridge to see if there's an apple or some other item that someone has left behind. The only thing that's in the fridge is a pizza box with 4 slices of pizza in it. You realize that this could potentially be someone's lunch, but it's the middle of the afternoon, so chances are, this is just someone's leftovers. Before you know it, you've eaten 3 of the 4 pieces. Just as you're cleaning up from your lunch, one of your co-workers walks in and mentions what a crazy day they've been having and how they just now finally have a chance to eat their lunch. They go on to tell you that they brought this great pizza that they had for dinner last night and ask you if you'd like to join them and have a slice. As they are saying this to you, they open the fridge and discover that they only have one slice of pizza left. Your co-worker is extremely upset because they've been

How well were you able to imagine yourself in the above scenario?

How guilty would you feel if you were actually in this situation?

How realistic did you find the above scenario?

How ashamed would you feel if you were actually in this situation?

How awful would you feel if you were actually in this situation?

How responsible would you feel if you were actually in this situation?

Scenario 7

How well were you able to imagine yourself in the above scenario?

1 2 3 4 5
(not at all) (very)

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

1 2 3 4 5
(not at all) (very)

1 2 3 4 5
(not at all) (very)

1 2 3 4 5
(not at all) (very)

Your best friend tells you in confidence that they've cheated on their partner. Although you know you shouldn't break your friend's confidence, this is too juicy a secret to keep to yourself. You only tell one other person, but the secret quickly spreads. Because you betrayed your best friend's confidence, their relationship with their partner is now over.

1 2 3 4 5
(not at all) (very)

1 2 3 4 5
(not at all) (very)

1 2 3 4 5
(not at all) (very)

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

1 2 3 4 5
(not at all) (very)

You are babysitting the 3 year old child of a good friend of the family's. Around 7:00pm, you find yourself bored with watching Barney, so you leave the child sitting quietly watching the television and you go and give your friend a call. After 15 minutes of chitchatting on the phone, you return to the family room where you'd left the child, and find that the child is no longer there. You search the main floor and discover that while you were on the phone with your friend, the child had wandered into the kitchen and drank cleaning fluid. You call 911 and the child is rushed to the hospital.

1 2 3 4 5
(not at all) (very)

1 2 3 4 5
(not at all) (very)

1 2 3 4 5
(not at all) (very)

1 2 3 4 5
(not at all) (very)

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

Scenario 10

You're working on an essay that's due in a couple of days but you run into a huge problem: all the books on that topic have been signed out of the library. The friend you're complaining about this to mentions that they actually have one of those books signed out and that they're done with it and you're more than welcome to take it. As they're giving it to you, your friend mentions that the book is due back to the library in 3 days and asks you to bring it back by then. The next few days are busy ones and the fact that you have to return the book totally slips your mind. When you finally remember to return the book it is over a week late. You don't have any cash on you to pay the late fine and the bank machine is nowhere near the library and you really don't feel like walking all the way over to it, so you just slip the book into the return hatch. A few days later your friend calls you upset because they went to borrow another book from the library but weren't allowed because they didn't have any money and couldn't pay their late fine for the book that you borrowed.

How well were you able to imagine yourself in the above scenario?

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

How guilty would you feel if you were actually in this situation?

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

How realistic did you find the above scenario?

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

How ashamed would you feel if you were actually in this situation?

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

How awful would you feel if you were actually in this situation?

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

How responsible would you feel if you were actually in this situation?

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

Scenario 11

You've had a really rotten day, just one of those days where absolutely everything goes wrong. All you want to do is sit at home by yourself and watch a movie and have nothing to do with anybody else. Just as you're sitting down to start your movie, your good friend calls you upset again over some date that didn't go well. As your friend goes on and on

about their romantic problems, which seem so insignificant after all the problems you dealt with today, you finally just can't take it anymore and yell at them that there are worse things in life to have happen than a bad date and they need to stop being so shallow and self-centered. Your friend gets very quiet and then, obviously upset, say they're sorry to have bothered you and hang up.

How well were you able to imagine yourself in the above scenario?

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

How guilty would you feel if you were actually in this situation?

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

How realistic did you find the above scenario?

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

How ashamed would you feel if you were actually in this situation?

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

How awful would you feel if you were actually in this situation?

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

How responsible would you feel if you were actually in this situation?

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

YOUR REFLECTIONS:

Please write down any thoughts you may have about any of these scenarios: any reactions you have to them, any feelings they invoke, any critical comments you have, and any ways in which you think they could be improved.

APPENDIX C

STUDY 1 INFORMED CONSENT

Brock University Department of Psychology Consent Form

Title of Study: Forgiveness-seeking Scenario Effectiveness

Principal Researcher: Jessica Rourke, Psychology, jr99ae@brocku.ca

Faculty Supervisor: Kathryn Belicki, Psychology, kbelicki@brocku.ca

Name of Participant (please print):

This research study is being conducted as part of a Psychology Masters Thesis at Brock University. I understand that this study in which I have agreed to participate will include reading scenarios, ranking them in terms of their severity and then answering questions about how they make me feel. I understand that this research study in which I am participating is being conducted to assess whether or not the scenarios elicit the types and levels of feelings that the researcher is attempting to get at. Filling out the questionnaires will take approximately forty minutes, and I understand that for my participation, I will be allotted one hour towards fulfilling the research requirement for my course. I understand that if my course does not have a research requirement, no payment will be provided.

I understand that there are minimal risks involved in this study. Specifically, some of the scenarios I will be asked to imagine involve serious consequences to others. I understand that any feelings these scenarios may elicit are perfectly normal. I also understand that none of these scenarios are based on actual events. I understand that my participation in this study is completely voluntary and that I may withdraw from this study at any time, for any reason, and without penalty. I understand that I am under no obligation to answer any questions or participate in any aspect of this study that I consider invasive, offensive, or inappropriate.

I understand that all personal data will be kept strictly confidential and all information will be coded so that my name is not associated with my answers. In particular, any material with my name on it, such as this form, will be collected and stored separately from the questionnaires. I understand that the principal investigator and

the faculty supervisor reserve the right to re-analyze the data in the future to examine questions that may become relevant with the passage of time. I also understand that if, in the future, a researcher associated with an accredited University requests access to this data, such access will be given.

I understand and agree to the statements mentioned above.

Participant's Signature: _____

Date: _____

Principal Researcher's Signature: _____

Date: _____

This study has been reviewed and approved by the Brock Research Ethics Board.
(File #05-100)

If you have any questions or concerns about your participation in this study, you may contact Jessica Rourke at jr99ae@brocku.ca. You may also contact the Office of Research Services at 905-688-5550 ext. 3035.

You can obtain feedback about the results of this study by the beginning of December 2005.

Thank you for your help! Please take one copy of this form with you for further reference.

APPENDIX D

STUDY 1 DEBRIEFING FORM
Brock University Department of Psychology
Debriefing and Feedback Letter
Forgiveness-seeking Scenario Effectiveness

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation. I am very mindful that that I asked you to read scenarios that may have brought up painful and sensitive issues. Your willingness to share your thoughts and feelings made this study possible. I am truly thankful.

The study you just participated in was a pilot study that was testing the effectiveness of forgiveness-seeking scenarios at eliciting certain levels of feelings such as guilt. The scenarios that were effective at doing this will be used to revise a broader questionnaire that assesses forgiveness-seeking behaviours and motivations. All participants in this study were asked to read and answer questions about the same scenarios.

If these scenarios upset you in any way, please do not hesitate to speak to someone about it. Please keep in mind that there were no right or wrong feelings to be experienced after reading these scenarios, and so any emotion that you felt was perfectly normal. In addition, it is important for you to keep in mind that all of these scenarios were fictional and none were based on actual life events.

I would really appreciate it if you did not discuss any aspect of this study with anyone until after August 30, 2005, as it could inadvertently affect the answers of future participants filling out the broader questionnaire that these scenarios will be incorporated into.

Once again, thank you for your participation! If you have any questions or concerns regarding your participation, please feel free to contact me, Jessica Rourke, at jr99ae@brocku.ca. The results of this study will be available by December 2005. If you are interested in the results of this study, you can e-mail me and I will gladly send you that information.

Thank you very much,

Jessica Rourke

APPENDIX E

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer the following:

Age:

Gender:

Religious orientation:

What if anything, did you hear about this study before coming here today? It is not important from whom you heard it, just what it was that you heard.

Occupation:

Birth date (month-year):

APPENDIX F

PALHAUS SOCIAL DESIRABILITY INVENTORY (BIDR)

Using the scale below as a guide, write a number beside each statement to indicate how true it is.



- _____ 1. My first impressions of people usually turn out to be right.
- _____ 2. It would be hard for me to break any of my bad habits.
- _____ 3. I don't care to know what other people really think of me.
- _____ 4. I have not always been honest with myself.
- _____ 5. I always know why I like things.
- _____ 6. When my emotions are aroused, it biases my thinking.
- _____ 7. Once I've made up my mind, other people can seldom change my opinion.
- _____ 8. I am not a safe driver when I exceed the speed limit.
- _____ 9. I am fully in control of my own fate.
- _____ 10. It's hard for me to shut off a disturbing thought.
- _____ 11. I never regret my decisions.
- _____ 12. I sometimes lose out on things because I can't make up my mind soon enough.
- _____ 13. The reason I vote is because my vote can make a difference.
- _____ 14. My parents were not always fair when they punished me.
- _____ 15. I am a completely rational person.
- _____ 16. I rarely appreciate criticism.
- _____ 17. I am very confident of my judgments.
- _____ 18. I have sometimes doubted my ability as a lover.
- _____ 19. It's all right with me if some people happen to dislike me.
- _____ 20. I don't always know the reasons why I do the things I do.
- _____ 21. I sometimes tell lies if I have to.
- _____ 22. I never cover up my mistakes.
- _____ 23. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.
- _____ 24. I never swear.
- _____ 25. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
- _____ 26. I always obey laws, even if I'm unlikely to get caught.
- _____ 27. I have said something bad about a friend behind his/her back.
- _____ 28. When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening.
- _____ 29. I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him or her.
- _____ 30. I always declare everything at customs.
- _____ 31. When I was young I sometimes stole things.
- _____ 32. I have never dropped litter on the street.
- _____ 33. I sometimes drive faster than the speed limit.
- _____ 34. I never read sexy books or magazines.
- _____ 35. I have done things that I don't tell other people about.
- _____ 36. I never take things that don't belong to me.
- _____ 37. I have taken sick-leave from work or school even though I wasn't really sick.
- _____ 38. I have never damaged a library book or store merchandise without reporting it.
- _____ 39. I have some pretty awful habits.
- _____ 40. I don't gossip about other people's business.

APPENDIX G

FORMATTED QUESTIONNAIRE

Please read the following scenario and imagine that you are the offender.

You're at a party and you've had a few drinks, but you feel fine, and you offer to give your best friend a ride home. Others at the party suggest that you call a cab, but you reiterate that you feel fine, and so you get behind the wheel and set off. On the way home, you lose control of the car and crash into a tree. You and your friend are taken to the hospital. You have a broken leg and arm: your friend will never walk again.

When answering the following questions, please answer them in terms of what you would be feeling and what you would do if you were actually the offender in the above situation.

How well were you able to imagine yourself in the above scenario?

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

How guilty would you feel if you were actually in this situation?

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

How realistic did you find the above scenario?

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

How ashamed would you feel if you were actually in this situation?

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

How awful would you feel if you were actually in this situation?

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

How responsible would you feel if you were actually in this situation?

1	2	3	4	5
(not at all)				(very)

When answering the following questions, please imagine that the above situation just took place. When a situation such as that happens, different people have different things on their minds. Each of us has an IMMEDIATE reaction – needs or concerns that we feel must be dealt with RIGHT AWAY. Later, when these concerns have been addressed, new concerns or needs may enter our minds; things that we need to address BEFORE WE CAN MOVE ON from the situation.

Some of the concerns we feel we need to deal with involve different people: ourselves, the person(s) we hurt, others in society, and/or God. In the following items, when we refer to “person(s) hurt”, we mean the individuals who were directly affected by the transgression. When we refer to “others” we are talking about others in society who may not have directly been hurt by the event, but may still have been affected by it.

Please rate on the following scales how concerned you would be about each item. We would first like you to rate which items you would be **IMMEDIATELY** concerned about **RIGHT AFTER** the situation occurs. Next, we would like you to rate which items you would be concerned about **LATER ON**; things that you would eventually need to address in order **TO MOVE ON** from the situation.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Unconcerned			Unsure			Extremely Concerned

CONCERN

1. Avoiding punishment or retribution
2. God not helping me when I need it
3. The person(s) I hurt not helping me when I need it
4. Others (those not hurt) not helping me when I need it
5. The person(s) I hurt being angry
6. God being angry
7. Others being angry

[illegible]

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Unconcerned			Unsure			Extremely Concerned

CONCERN

	Immediately			To Move on		
34. God having too much power over me	0	1	2	3	4	5
35. The person(s) I hurt having no respect for me	0	1	2	3	4	5
36. God having no respect for me	0	1	2	3	4	5
37. Others having no respect for me	0	1	2	3	4	5
38. How the person(s) I hurt could be affected if our relationship ends	0	1	2	3	4	5
39. How God may be affected if my relationship with God ends	0	1	2	3	4	5
40. How others may be affected if my relationships with them end	0	1	2	3	4	5
41. How the person(s) I hurt may be affected if our relationship changes	0	1	2	3	4	5
42. How God may be affected if my relationship with God changes	0	1	2	3	4	5
43. How others may be affected if my relationships with them change	0	1	2	3	4	5
44. How the person(s) I hurt may be feeling badly because they can no longer trust me	0	1	2	3	4	5
45. How God may be feeling badly because God can no longer trust me	0	1	2	3	4	5
46. How others may be feeling badly because they can no longer trust me	0	1	2	3	4	5
47. The person(s) I hurt feeling that they must forgive me, even if they don't want to	0	1	2	3	4	5
48. Others I hurt feeling that they must forgive me, even if they don't want to	0	1	2	3	4	5
49. The person(s) I hurt being intimidated by me	0	1	2	3	4	5
50. Others being intimidated by me	0	1	2	3	4	5
51. The person(s) I hurt being afraid that I will hurt them again in the future	0	1	2	3	4	5
52. God blaming the person(s) I hurt	0	1	2	3	4	5
53. Others blaming the person(s) I hurt	0	1	2	3	4	5
54. God thinking less of the person(s) I hurt	0	1	2	3	4	5
55. Others thinking less of the person(s) I hurt	0	1	2	3	4	5

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Unconcerned			Unsure			Extremely Concerned

CONCERN

CONCERN

	Immediately							To Move on						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
56. The person(s) I hurt thinking that I blame them at least partially for what happened	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
57. The person(s) I hurt being afraid to trust people	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
58. Others being afraid to trust people	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
59. The person(s) I hurt feeling bitter	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
60. Others feeling bitter	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
61. God feeling bitter	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
62. The person(s) I hurt feeling badly	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
63. Others feeling badly	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
64. God feeling badly	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
65. The person(s) I hurt blaming himself/herself	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
66. The person(s) I hurt being disappointed with himself/herself	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
67. The person(s) I hurt losing their self-esteem	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
68. Others feeling vulnerable because my actions undermined society's values/norms	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
69. The person(s) I hurt feeling vulnerable	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
70. Others being afraid that I could hurt someone else in the future	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
71. Society being afraid that others will do as I did	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
72. My society looking badly to other societies because of what I've done	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
73. Others suffering from shock	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
74. The person(s) I hurt suffering from shock	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
75. Society blaming itself	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6

When answering the following questions, please continue imagining that the above situation just took place. As previously stated, when a situation like that occurs, different people have different concerns on their minds. In addition, each person deals with each concern in different ways. Each of us will engage in an IMMEDIATE behaviour to deal with the IMMEDIATE concern that we have. When dealing with our most pressing concerns, there is only so much that we can do, therefore, as time goes by and we can do more, we may turn to other behaviours and strategies to deal with our concerns.

Please rate on the following scales what type of behaviours/strategies you would use. We would first like you to rate which behaviours/strategies you would use **RIGHT AWAY**, to deal with your **IMMEDIATE** concerns. Next, we would like you to rate which behaviours/strategies you would **LATER**, after some time has gone by, the behaviours/strategies that you would use in the **LONGER TERM**.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Definitely not do this			Unsure	Definitely do this		

BEHAVIOUR/STRATEGY

BEHAVIOUR/STRATEGY	Immediately							Longer Term						
1. I would do whatever it took, for however long it took, to make things better	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. I would do something fun to take my mind off of the situation	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. I would give the person(s) I hurt some space	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. I would let the person(s) I hurt know that I understand that I hurt them	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. I would go see the person(s) I hurt	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. I would explain my actions, making sure the person(s) hurt knew I was in the wrong	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. I would take time for myself to work through my negative emotions	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. I would pray to God	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. I would avoid the person(s) I hurt	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. I would take some time to nurse myself and do something nice for myself	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. I would take some time to collect my thoughts and reflect on what I've done	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Definitely not do this			Unsure			Definitely do this

BEHAVIOUR/STRATEGY

BEHAVIOUR/STRATEGY								Immediately							Longer Term						
12.	I would seek out the person(s) I hurt, to talk things over							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
13.	I would seek the advice or opinion of a friend or family member about how I could fix the situation							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
14.	I would give the person(s) I hurt gifts to make up for what I did							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
15.	I would work on forgiving myself							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
16.	I would call the person(s) I hurt							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
17.	I would try to hide what I had done							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
18.	I would have someone else talk to the person(s) I hurt on my behalf							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
19.	I would ask for forgiveness							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
20.	I would try to come to terms with what I'd done							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
21.	I would write to the person(s) I hurt							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
22.	I would shift some of the blame to the person(s) I hurt							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
23.	I would go off on my own to calm myself down							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
24.	I would take full responsibility for what happened							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
25.	I would prove myself over and over again to the person(s) I had hurt							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
26.	I would blame someone else							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
27.	I would try and justify my actions							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
28.	I would do whatever the person(s) I hurt asked of me, to try to fix the situation							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
29.	I would go to the person(s) I hurt and explain my actions so that he/she would know it was not his/her fault							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
30.	I would apologize for the hurt I've caused							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
31.	I would ask for understanding							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6

1. In regards to the scenario that you read, please rate on the following scale **how true of you** each statement would be.

a) I would need to receive forgiveness from the person(s) I hurt before I could feel like a good person again.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all true			Unsure			Extremely true

b) I would need to receive forgiveness from others/society before I could feel like a good person again.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all true			Unsure			Extremely true

c) I would need to receive forgiveness from God before I could feel like a good person again.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all true			Unsure			Extremely true

d) I would need to forgive myself before I could feel like a good person again.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all true			Unsure			Extremely true

2. Please rank order the importance of each of the following statements from 1(**MOST important**) to 4 (**LEAST important**).

_____ I would need to receive forgiveness from the person(s) I hurt before I could feel like a good person again.

_____ I would need to receive forgiveness from others before I could feel like a good person again.

_____ I would need to receive forgiveness from God before I could feel like a good person again.

_____ I would need to forgive myself before I could feel like a good person again.

APPENDIX H

COMMENTS QUESTIONNAIRE

Post-Study Questionnaire

Please provide us with ALL comments that you may have about the questions in this questionnaire, the format of the questionnaire, or anything else that you can think of in regards to the study.

Your answers to our questionnaire, as well as your feedback, are going to be the basis of revisions to the questionnaire. In the future, we will want to know what participants think about the purposes of the questionnaire. If you were a participant in a future study that used this questionnaire, what would you guess were the hypotheses/purposes of the study?

In this study we included personality measures that we will look at in relation to the questionnaire. What do you think we might find?

Thinking about the overall questionnaire, what else do you think we may find or are hoping to find?

APPENDIX I

VERBAL SCRIPT

Hello and welcome to Forgiveness-Seeking Motives and Behaviours: Building a Questionnaire. As the title of my study suggests, I'm attempting to construct a questionnaire that assess the different motives people have for seeking forgiveness, as well as the different behaviours they engage in to address these motives. The reason that I am creating this questionnaire is because in the forgiveness research field, there exists no questionnaires that examine forgiveness-seeking.

For this study, you are going to be asked to imagine that you are the offender in 3 different situations. After each situation, you will answer a series of questions about what you would be feeling and what you would do if you were actually the offender in that situation.

This is the first test-run of this questionnaire, so there are a lot of questions to answer. Please take your time in answering and answer as honestly as possible. You guys are really helping me figure out which questions will be the best to keep in the final version of the questionnaire. By answering each of these questions, you're going to be helping me to cut down the number of questions I will need for the final version.

In order to test the reliability and validity of the questionnaire, this study is going to take part in 2 sessions. The second session will be shorter than this one, and will probably take up about 45 minutes of your time. So after you hand in your completed questionnaire package, and if you are willing, I am going to have you sign up for your second and final session.

I thank you for your time and patience, and most of all, for your collaboration in helping me create this questionnaire. I am now going to read the consent form with you...

APPENDIX J

SESSION 1 CONSENT FORM

Brock University Department of Psychology Consent Form

Session #1

Project Title: Forgiveness-Seeking Motives and Behaviours: Building a Questionnaire

Principal Investigator: Jessica Rourke, MA
student
Department of Psychology, Brock University
jr99ae@brocku.ca
905-688-5550, ext. 3873

Faculty Supervisor: Kathryn Belicki,
Professor
Department of Psychology, Brock
University
kbelicki@brocku.ca
(905) 688-5550 Ext. 3873

INVITATION

You are invited to participate in a research study examining the motives for, and approaches to forgiveness-seeking.

WHAT'S INVOLVED

As a participant, you will be asked to read some scenarios and imagine that you are the offender (person who hurts another) in them. You will also be asked to answer some questions about these scenarios. In addition, you will be completing some general personality measures. Participation will take place in 2 sessions, the first one lasting approximately 1.5 hours of your time and the second one lasting approximately 1 hour of your time. The second session that you will be asked to return for will take place approximately 2 weeks after the first session. As compensation for your participation in each of the sessions, you will have the choice of receiving 1 or 1.5 hours of research credit (depending on the session), or a \$2.00 Tim Horton's gift certificate. You can choose the same compensation for both sessions, or you can choose one for the first session and the other for the second.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS AND RISKS

Possible benefits of participation include gaining a first-hand experience of the research process, and participating in the creation of a forgiveness-seeking model that will be useful for counsellors and therapists. There may also be some minimal risks associated with participation. Some of the scenarios you will be reading have serious consequences and may make you feel upset. It is important to know that all of these scenarios are fictitious (not based on true events).

CONFIDENTIALITY

All data will be kept strictly confidential and all information will be coded so that your name is not associated with your answers. Any material with your name on it, such as this

form, will be collected and stored separately from the questionnaires. The principal investigator and the faculty supervisor reserve the right to re-analyze the data in the future to examine questions that may become relevant with the passage of time. In addition, if, in the future, a researcher associated with an accredited University requests access to this data, such access will be given. Data collected during this study will be kept for 5 years after publication and stored in a locked office at Brock University, after which it will be destroyed.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION

Participation in this study is voluntary. If you wish, you may decline to answer any questions or to participate in any component of the study. Further, you may decide to withdraw from this study at any time and may do so without any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are entitled. This means that should you wish to withdraw from the study, you will still receive compensation.

PUBLICATION OF RESULTS

Results of this study may be published in professional journals and presented at conferences. Feedback about this study will be available in September of 2006. Please contact the Principal Investigator at jr99ae@brocku.ca if you wish to know the results.

CONTACT INFORMATION AND ETHICS CLEARANCE

If you have any questions about this study or require further information, please contact the Principal Investigator or the Faculty Supervisor using the contact information provided above. This study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through the Research Ethics Board at Brock University (file #05-238). If you have any comments or concerns about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Research Ethics Office at (905) 688-5550 Ext. 3035, reb@brocku.ca.

Thank you for your assistance in this project.

CONSENT

If you agree with the following statement, please sign both copies of the consent form. Give one back to the researcher and keep the other one for your records.

I agree to participate in this study described above. I have made this decision based on the information I have read in this Consent Letter. I have had the opportunity to receive any additional details I wanted about the study and understand that I may ask questions in the future. I understand that I may withdraw this consent at any time.

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

COMPENSATION

Please place a check next to the type of compensation you would like to receive for this session of the study. NOTE: You can only receive one type of compensation per session.

☐ **Research Participation Only**

I am participating in this experiment for 1.5 hours of research participation towards the requirements of the following course: _____ and will not receive monetary payment for this experiment.

Signature of participant

Signature of experimenter

☐ **Financial Reward Only**

I am participating in this experiment for a \$2.00 Tim Horton's gift certificate. This experiment will not count toward research participation hours in a psychology course.

Signature of participant

Signature of experimenter

APPENDIX K

SESSION 1 DEBRIEFING LETTER

Brock University Department of Psychology

Debriefing and Feedback Letter Session 1

Forgiveness-Seeking Motives and Behaviours: Building a Questionnaire

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation. I am very mindful that I asked you to read scenarios that may have brought up painful and sensitive issues. Your willingness to share your thoughts and feelings made this study possible. I am truly thankful.

The study you just participated in was a test-run of a newly created forgiveness-seeking questionnaire assessing forgiveness-seeking behaviours and motivations. Our main interest is examining whether different personality traits are associated with different motives that prompt them to engage in forgiveness-seeking behaviours. We are also examining if differing personality traits lead people to engage in different types of forgiveness-seeking behaviours. All participants in this study were asked to read and answer questions about the same scenarios.

If these scenarios upset you in any way, please do not hesitate to speak to someone about it. For example, you can contact the Student Development Counselling Centre located on the 4th floor of the Schmon Tower at 905-688-5550, ext. 4750. Please keep in mind that there were no right or wrong feelings to be experienced after reading these scenarios, and so any emotion that you felt was perfectly normal. In addition, it is important for you to keep in mind that all of these scenarios were fictional and none were based on actual life events. It is also really important to remember that although all of these scenarios had someone committing an act with negative consequences, this was solely to create situations that would require forgiveness-seeking. Most often people behave in nice, considerate and even generous ways; therefore it is important to remember the good in people and not walk away reflecting only on the bad.

I would really appreciate it if you did not discuss any aspect of this study with anyone until after August 31, 2006, as it could inadvertently affect the answers of future participants filling out the same questionnaire.

Once again, thank you for your participation, and I'll see you at your next session! If you have any questions or concerns regarding your participation, please feel free to contact me, Jessica Rourke, at jr99ae@brocku.ca. The results of this study will be available by September of 2006. If you are interested in the results of this study, you can e-mail me and I will gladly send you that information.

Thank you very much,

Jessica Rourke

APPENDIX L

INFORMATION LETTER

Hi!

Thank you so much for agreeing to participate in my study. Following, is a brief description of the study as well as a guide for your participation process. PLEASE follow this process **VERY** carefully as any deviation from it could skew the results.

The purpose of this study is to create a questionnaire that assesses forgiveness-seeking motives and behaviours. I realize that there are a lot of items in this questionnaire, unfortunately this is how we must proceed with the first run of a new scale. You are a colleague in this study, as your answers will help to drastically reduce the number of items needed to assess what we are looking for. I appreciate your patience and cooperation!

This study takes part in 2 sessions (approximately 3 weeks apart). The package you have received contains everything you need for both sessions. On the bottom right-hand corner of the front of each stapled booklet (there are 2 such booklets), you'll notice a number. The booklet with only a number is for session 1, while the booklet with a number and the letter "B" is for session 2.

Below is a checklist to guide you through each session. You may do your sessions at the same time and in the same location as someone else who is doing this study, but please answer the questions individually. Session 1 will take between 60-90 minutes while session 2 will take between 40-60 minutes. Feel free to take snack breaks and bathroom breaks, but otherwise, please fill out the entire package in one sitting. Please do not talk about your answers or anything pertaining to the questionnaire until AFTER you have completed session 2 and mailed back your responses.

When you are doing session 2, please **DO NOT** look back at any of your answers from session one, as this will render the results useless.

****I ask you for your birth date (month-year) for the sole purpose of being able to match your session 1 data to your session 2 data**

CHECKLIST

SESSION 1:

- ☐ Read consent form labelled session 1. Sign and date one copy and put it in the small white envelope labelled "consent forms". The other copy is for you to keep.
- ☐ Fill out the package for session 1 (with only a number on the right-hand corner)
- ☐ Read debriefing letter for session 1 and mark on your calendar when you will do session 2 (approximately 3 weeks from today, give or take a few days – according to your schedule)

SESSION 2:

- ☐ Read consent form labelled session 2. Sign and date one copy and put it in the small white envelope with your consent form from session 1. The other copy is for you to keep.
- ☐ Fill out the package for session 2 (the one with a number and the letter "B" on the right-hand corner)
- ☐ Read debriefing letter for session 2
- ☐ Put the sealed envelope with your consent forms as well as your 2 completed packages in the large envelope and mail it back to Jessica (the postage has been pre-paid for you). Consent form envelopes will immediately be separated from the booklets, and opened only when forms from all participants have been received, thus ensuring the anonymity of your data.

THANK YOU!

APPENDIX M

SESSION 2 CONSENT FORM

Brock University Department of Psychology Consent Form

Session #2

Project Title: Forgiveness-Seeking Motives and Behaviours: Building a Questionnaire

Principal Investigator: Jessica Rourke, MA
student

Department of Psychology, Brock
University jr99ae@brocku.ca
905-688-5550, ext. 3873

Faculty Supervisor: Kathryn Belicki,
Professor

Department of Psychology, Brock
University
kbelicki@brocku.ca
(905) 688-5550 Ext. 3873

INVITATION

You are invited to participate in a research study examining the motives for, and approaches to forgiveness-seeking.

WHAT'S INVOLVED

As a participant, you will be asked to complete the same forgiveness-seeking questionnaire that you completed in session 1 to see if you have a different perspective with the passage of time. This is the 2nd session of a 2-part study. You can only participate in this session if you have participated in the first session. This session will last approximately 1 hour of your time. As compensation for your participation in the session, you have the choice of receiving 1 hour of research credit, or a \$2.00 Tim Horton's gift certificate. You do not have to choose the same type of compensation that you chose for the first session.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS AND RISKS

Possible benefits of participation include gaining a first-hand experience of the research process, and participating in the creation of a forgiveness-seeking model that will be useful for counsellors and therapists. There may also be some minimal risks associated with participation. Some of the scenarios you will be reading have serious consequences and may make you feel upset. It is important to know that all of these scenarios are fictitious (not based on true events).

CONFIDENTIALITY

All data will be kept strictly confidential and all information will be coded so that your name is not associated with your answers. Any material with your name on it, such as this form, will be collected and stored separately from the questionnaires. The principal investigator and the faculty supervisor reserve the right to re-analyze the data in the future to examine questions that may become relevant with the passage of time. In

addition, if, in the future, a researcher associated with an accredited University requests access to this data, such access will be given. Data collected during this study will be kept for 5 years after publication and stored in a locked office at Brock University, after which it will be destroyed.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION

Participation in this study is voluntary. If you wish, you may decline to answer any questions or to participate in any component of the study. Further, you may decide to withdraw from this study at any time and may do so without any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are entitled. This means that should you wish to withdraw from the study, you will still receive compensation.

PUBLICATION OF RESULTS

Results of this study may be published in professional journals and presented at conferences. Feedback about this study will be available in September of 2006. Please contact the Principal Investigator at jr99ae@brocku.ca if you wish to know the results.

CONTACT INFORMATION AND ETHICS CLEARANCE

If you have any questions about this study or require further information, please contact the Principal Investigator or the Faculty Supervisor using the contact information provided above. This study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through the Research Ethics Board at Brock University (file #05-238). If you have any comments or concerns about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Research Ethics Office at (905) 688-5550 Ext. 3035, reb@brocku.ca.

Thank you for your assistance in this project.

CONSENT

If you agree with the following statement, please sign both copies of the consent form. Give one back to the researcher and keep the other one for your records.

I agree to participate in this study described above. I have made this decision based on the information I have read in this Consent Letter. I have had the opportunity to receive any additional details I wanted about the study and understand that I may ask questions in the future. I understand that I may withdraw this consent at any time.

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

COMPENSATION

Please place a check next to the type of compensation you would like to receive for this session of the study. NOTE: You can only receive one type of compensation per session.

☐ Research Participation Only

I am participating in this experiment for 1 hour of research participation towards the requirements of the following course: _____ and will not receive monetary payment for this experiment.

Signature of participant

Signature of experimenter

☐ Financial Reward Only

I am participating in this experiment for a \$2.00 Tim Horton's gift certificate. This experiment will not count toward research participation hours in a psychology course.

Signature of participant

Signature of experimenter

APPENDIX N

SESSION 2 DEBRIEFING LETTER

Brock University Department of Psychology

Debriefing and Feedback Letter Session 2

Forgiveness-Seeking Motives and Behaviours: Building a Questionnaire

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation. I am very mindful that I asked you to read scenarios that may have brought up painful and sensitive issues. Your willingness to share your thoughts and feelings made this study possible. I am truly thankful.

The study you just participated in was the second session of a test-run of a newly created forgiveness-seeking questionnaire assessing forgiveness-seeking behaviours and motivations. Our main interest is examining whether different personality traits are associated with different motives that prompt them to engage in forgiveness-seeking behaviours. We are also examining if differing personality traits lead people to engage in different types of forgiveness-seeking behaviours. All participants in this study were asked to read and answer questions about the same scenarios. This session had you reading the same scenarios and answering the same questions as you did in the first session in order to check for test-retest reliability.

If these scenarios upset you in any way, please do not hesitate to speak to someone about it. For example, you can contact the Student Development Counselling Centre located on the 4th floor of the Schmon Tower at 905-688-5550, ext. 4750. Please keep in mind that there were no right or wrong feelings to be experienced after reading these scenarios, and so any emotion that you felt was perfectly normal. In addition, it is important for you to keep in mind that all of these scenarios were fictional and none were based on actual life events. It is also really important to remember that although all of these scenarios had someone committing an act with negative consequences, this was solely to create situations that would require forgiveness-seeking. Most often people

behave in nice, considerate and even generous ways; therefore it is important to remember the good in people and not walk away reflecting only on the bad.

I would really appreciate it if you did not discuss any aspect of this study with anyone until after August 31, 2006, as it could inadvertently affect the answers of future participants filling out the same questionnaire.

Once again, thank you for your participation! If you have any questions or concerns regarding your participation, please feel free to contact me, Jessica Rourke, at jr99ae@brocku.ca. The results of this study will be available by September of 2006. If you are interested in the results of this study, you can e-mail me and I will gladly send you that information.

Thank you very much,

Jessica Rourke

SESSION 2 DEBRIEFING LETTER

Brock University Department of Psychology

Debriefing and Feedback Letter Session 2

Forgiveness-Seeking Motives and Behaviours: Building a Questionnaire

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation. I am very mindful that I asked you to read scenarios that may have brought up painful and sensitive issues. Your willingness to share your thoughts and feelings made this study possible. I am truly thankful.

The study you just participated in was the second session of a test-run of a newly created forgiveness-seeking questionnaire assessing forgiveness-seeking behaviours and motivations. Our main interest is examining whether different personality traits are associated with different motives that prompt them to engage in forgiveness-seeking behaviours. We are also examining if differing personality traits lead people to engage in different types of forgiveness-seeking behaviours. All participants in this study were asked to read and answer questions about the same scenarios. This session had you reading the same scenarios and answering the same questions as you did in the first session in order to check for test-retest reliability.

If these scenarios upset you in any way, please do not hesitate to speak to someone about it. For example, you can contact the Student Development Counselling Centre located on the 4th floor of the Schmon Tower at 905-688-5550, ext. 4750. Please keep in mind that there were no right or wrong feelings to be experienced after reading these scenarios, and so any emotion that you felt was perfectly normal. In addition, it is important for you to keep in mind that all of these scenarios were fictional and none were based on actual life events. It is also really important to remember that although all of these scenarios had someone committing an act with negative consequences, this was solely to create situations that would require forgiveness-seeking. Most often people

behave in nice, considerate and even generous ways; therefore it is important to remember the good in people and not walk away reflecting only on the bad.

I would really appreciate it if you did not discuss any aspect of this study with anyone until after August 31, 2006, as it could inadvertently affect the answers of future participants filling out the same questionnaire.

Once again, thank you for your participation! If you have any questions or concerns regarding your participation, please feel free to contact me, Jessica Rourke, at jr99ae@brocku.ca. The results of this study will be available by September of 2006. If you are interested in the results of this study, you can e-mail me and I will gladly send you that information.

Thank you very much,

Jessica Rourke

