

Running head: AFTER THE RUPTURE

After the Rupture: Victims and Perpetrators Share  
Joint Control over Victims' Post-Conflict Outcomes

Eli J. Finkel

Northwestern University

Laura B. Luchies

Northwestern University

**Word Count: 4664**

After the Rupture: Victims and Perpetrators Share  
Joint Control over Victims' Post-Conflict Outcomes

Given enough time, close relationship partners are bound to experience a conflict in which one person hurts, angers, or upsets the other. How can they heal their relationship? Scholars and clinicians have designed and implemented several forgiveness interventions (e.g., Hebl & Enright, 1993; Rye & Pargament, 2002; Worthington et al, 2000; for a review, see Wade & Worthington, 2005). Although their methods vary from helping victims develop empathy for their perpetrators, to having victims recall times they hurt others, to encouraging victims to make a commitment to forgive their perpetrators, forgiveness interventions share the goal of increasing victims' forgiveness. They also share the assumption that doing so will benefit victims. In other words, forgiveness interventions assume that victims have control over their own outcomes: If they forgive, they will experience better outcomes than if they do not forgive.

Past research shows that this assumption is not unfounded. Forgiveness has been linked to improved psychological health, physical health, and relational well-being. For example, those who forgive tend to enjoy greater life satisfaction and suffer fewer psychological distress symptoms (Bono, McCullough, & Root, 2008; Orcutt, 2006); evince better cardiac functioning and less physiological stress (McCullough, Orsulak, Brandon, & Akers, 2007; Waltman, et al., 2009); and experience greater closeness and commitment to their perpetrators, as well as enhanced conflict resolution, which predicts subsequent relationship quality (Hannon, Rusbult, Finkel, & Kumashiro, in press; Tsang, McCullough, & Fincham, 2006).

However, might perpetrators also have control over victims' outcomes? That is, might perpetrators' behavior, in tandem with victims' behavior, affect the quality of victims' outcomes following a betrayal? McCullough (2008) recently argued that forgiveness evolved to help people preserve their valuable relationships. We posit that, when forgiveness helps victims preserve a

relationship that is likely to be valuable to them in the future, it leads to positive outcomes for the victim, but when it preserves a relationship that is unlikely to be valuable, it leads to negative outcomes. What determines whether a continued relationship between the victim and the perpetrator is likely to be valuable? The perpetrator's behavior. A continued relationship in which the perpetrator "makes up for" his/her offenses is likely to be valuable, whereas a continued relationship in which the perpetrator does not make up for his/her offenses is unlikely to be valuable. According to this analysis, scholars and practitioners who have, explicitly or implicitly, suggested that forgiveness is uniformly good for victims might have oversimplified the story because victims do not have complete control over their own outcomes. Rather, the consequences of victims' forgiveness hinge on their perpetrators' behavior.

#### Interdependence Theory: Three Types of Control over Outcomes

Interdependence theory (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; Kelley et al., 2003) provides a framework for understanding the control two individuals have over their own and each others' outcomes, and this framework can be applied to the control victims and perpetrators have over victims' outcomes. Following a betrayal, perpetrators may make amends or not make amends and victims may forgive or not forgive. Victims' outcomes for each combination of their own and their perpetrators' behavior can be plotted in a  $2 \times 2$  table, as illustrated in Figure 1. (Perpetrators' outcomes can be included in the table as well, although we focus only on victims' outcomes because we seek to address the extant literature's focus on victims' outcomes).

In interdependence terminology (Kelley et al., 2003), *Actor control* (formerly called "reflexive control") is the amount of control one has over one's own outcomes. The amount of actor control victims have over their own outcomes can be derived by calculating the average difference between the victims' outcomes in the "Forgive" column and the victims' outcomes in the "Do Not Forgive" column (i.e.,  $((A + C) - (B + D)) / 2$ ). Actor control is analogous to the

main effect victim forgiveness has on victims' outcomes. *Partner control* (formerly called "fate control") is the amount of control one's partner has over one's outcomes. The amount of partner control perpetrators have over victims' outcomes can be derived by calculating the average difference between the victims' outcomes in the "Make Amends" row and the victims' outcomes in the "Do Not Make Amends" row (i.e.,  $((A + B) - (C + D)) / 2$ ). Partner control is analogous to the main effect perpetrator amends has on victims' outcomes. *Joint control* (formerly called "behavior control") is the amount of control one's self and one's partner jointly have over one's outcomes. The amount of joint control victims and perpetrators have over victims' outcomes can be derived by calculating the average difference between the victims' outcomes in the upper left and lower right cells and the victims' outcomes in the upper right and lower left cells (i.e.,  $((A + D) - (B + C)) / 2$ ). Joint control is analogous to the interaction effect between victim forgiveness and perpetrator amends on victims' outcomes.

#### A Review of Recent Evidence of Joint Control over Victims' Post-Conflict Outcomes

A series of four recent studies has investigated the interactive effects of victims' and perpetrators' behavior on victims' outcomes (Luchies, Finkel, McNulty, & Kumashiro, in press). We review this program of research, which includes two longitudinal studies (Studies 1 and 4) and two experimental studies (Studies 2 and 3) that examine the effects of victim forgiveness and perpetrator amends on victims' post-conflict self-respect and self-concept clarity. As explained above, forgiveness interventions assume that victims' outcomes are primarily subject to actor control. In contrast, we expect that victims and perpetrators share joint control over victims' outcomes. That is, we hypothesize that the effect of forgiving on one's self-respect and self-concept clarity depends on the perpetrator's behavior: When the perpetrator has made amends, we expect that forgiveness will bolster one's self-respect and self-concept clarity. But when the

perpetrator has not made amends, we expect that forgiveness will diminish one's self-respect and self-concept clarity.

### Study 1

Study 1 was a longitudinal investigation in which both members of 72 recently married couples completed up to nine questionnaires over the first five years of marriage. At the beginning of the study, participants reported (a) their tendency to forgive their spouse by imagining themselves in five situations that described their spouse transgressing against them (e.g., snapping at and insulting the self, lying about inappropriate behaviors with someone of the opposite sex) and reporting the extent to which they would feel and express forgiveness in each situation; (b) their agreeableness (e.g., "I take time out for others," "I feel little concern for others" [reversed]); and (c) their self-respect ("I wish I could have more respect for myself" [reversed]). Every 6-8 months following the initial assessment, participants completed additional reports of their self-respect. Although the extent to which perpetrators act in an agreeable manner is not our focal measure of perpetrator behavior, agreeableness has been linked with acting in a prosocial, constructive manner during interpersonal conflicts (Jensen-Campbell & Graziano, 2001) and with seeking forgiveness (Chiaromello, Sastre, & Mullet, 2008), which includes accepting responsibility and making reparation after committing a betrayal (Sandage, Worthington, Hight, & Berry, 2000). Because agreeable individuals tend to make amends, we use agreeableness as a proxy for amends in this study.

We conducted growth curve analyses (cf. Singer & Willett, 2003) to assess the associations of forgiveness and partner agreeableness with linear self-respect trajectories. Specifically, we predicted changes in participants' self-respect over time from their tendency to forgive their spouse, their spouse's agreeableness, time, and the interaction terms among these variables. Looking first at the main effects of victims' and perpetrators' behavior, in turn, on victims'

outcomes, there were no significant main effects of forgiveness or spouse agreeableness on trajectories of victims' self-respect. Thus, there was no evidence that victims have actor control or that perpetrators have partner control over changes in victims' self-respect over time.

Turning to the interaction effect of victims' behavior and perpetrators' behavior on victims' outcomes, the trajectory of self-respect for participants who reported a strong tendency to forgive their spouse depended on their spouse's agreeableness. Highly forgiving participants whose spouse reported high levels of agreeableness experienced increases in self-respect over time. In contrast, highly forgiving participants whose spouse reported low levels of agreeableness experienced decreases in self-respect over time. Thus, victims and perpetrators share joint control over changes in victims' self-respect over time.

Although the Study 1 findings are consistent with the idea that victims and perpetrators share joint control over victims' self-respect, Study 1 did not provide the experimental evidence necessary to conclude that forgiveness and perpetrator behavior *caused* the observed changes in self-respect over time. In addition, it did not examine whether victims' self-concept clarity follows the same pattern as their self-respect. Finally, it used an indirect measure of amends. We designed Study 2 to address these limitations.

### Study 2

Study 2 was an experiment in which 49 undergraduates received false feedback (using a procedure we adapted from Karremans, Van Lange, Ouwerkerk, & Kluwer, 2003) regarding the extent to which they have forgiven and the extent to which their perpetrator has made amends for a specific, real-life betrayal. Participants were asked to recall a recent incident in which a close other hurt, angered, or upset them. After providing a description of the incident, participants typed in the first name of the perpetrator and answered questions about the extent to which the perpetrator had made amends.

Then, participants read about the “forgiveness test,” which they were told would assess the extent to which they had forgiven their perpetrator. The forgiveness test was a version of the Implicit Association Test (IAT; Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998) which is designed to assess people’s implicit associations between categories by comparing their reaction times when categorizing words or images from target categories in different blocks of trials. The categories used in the forgiveness test were (a) the perpetrator’s first name and other first names and (b) words with positive valence (e.g., love, acceptance) and words with negative valence (e.g., hate, rejection). In one block of trials, participants were instructed to press the same key when presented with positive words and the perpetrator’s name. In another block, they were instructed to press the same key when presented with negative words and the perpetrator’s name.

After completing the forgiveness test, participants read that, when a person has forgiven a perpetrator, associations between positive words and the name of the perpetrator are stronger than associations between negative words and the name of the perpetrator. But when a person has not completely forgiven the perpetrator, associations between negative words and the name of the perpetrator are stronger. Then, they read that these associations can be measured through reaction times. Next, participants received false feedback regarding their reaction times in the forgiveness test. Participants in the *high forgiveness condition* were told that they responded faster in the block of trials in which they responded with the same key to positive words and the name of the perpetrator than in the block of trials in which they responded with the same key to negative words and the name of the perpetrator, which indicates that they have largely forgiven the perpetrator. Participants in the *low forgiveness condition* were told that they responded faster in the block of trials in which they responded with the same key to negative words and the name of the perpetrator than in the block of trials in which they responded with the same key to positive words

and the name of the perpetrator, which indicates that they have not completely forgiven the perpetrator.

Next, participants received false feedback regarding their responses to the questions they had answered earlier in the study about the extent to which their perpetrator had made amends. Participants in the *weak amends condition* were told that, compared to others who had previously participated in the study, their responses indicated that the extent to which their perpetrator had made amends was in the 17th percentile, which means that their perpetrator has made only weak amends. Participants in the *strong amends condition* were told that their responses indicated that the extent to which their perpetrator had made amends was in the 83rd percentile, which means that their perpetrator has made strong amends.

Following these manipulations, participants completed measures of self-respect and self-concept clarity (“I have a lot of respect for myself” and “I have a clear sense of who I am and what I am,” respectively). Finally, participants completed manipulation checks assessing the extent to which (a) they had forgiven the perpetrator and (b) the perpetrator had made amends, were probed for suspicion, and were debriefed. The manipulation checks indicated that the manipulations were successful: Participants in the high forgiveness condition reported having offered greater forgiveness than those in the low forgiveness condition, and participants in the strong amends condition reported having received greater amends than those in the weak amends condition.

We conducted two analyses of variance (ANOVAs) with forgiveness and amends feedback conditions as the between-subjects factors and with self-respect and self-concept clarity, in turn, as the dependent variable. Looking first at the main effects of victims’ and perpetrators’ behavior, in turn, on victims’ outcomes, there were no significant main effects of forgiveness or amends on self-respect or self-concept clarity. Thus, there was no evidence that victims have actor control or

that perpetrators have partner control over victims' post-conflict self-respect or self-concept clarity.

Turning to the interaction effect of victims' behavior and perpetrators' behavior on victims' outcomes, although the descriptive patterns of self-respect were in the predicted directions, the forgiveness  $\times$  amends interaction effect on self-respect did not reach conventional levels of significance. However, the effect of forgiveness on self-concept clarity did depend on whether or not the perpetrator made amends. Descriptively speaking, participants who were led to believe they had forgiven a perpetrator who made strong amends reported higher self-concept clarity than those who were led to believe they had not forgiven a perpetrator who made strong amends. In contrast, participants who were led to believe they had forgiven a perpetrator who made weak amends reported lower self-concept clarity than those who were led to believe they had not forgiven a perpetrator who made weak amends. Thus, victims and perpetrators share joint control over victims' post-conflict self-concept clarity.

Study 2 extended Study 1 by examining the effects of experimentally manipulating participants' perceptions of their own forgiveness of and perpetrator amends made for actual betrayals on both self-respect and self-concept clarity. We designed Study 3 to provide an additional test of the causal effects of forgiveness and amends on self-respect and self-concept clarity.

### Study 3

Study 3 was an experiment in which 247 undergraduates imagined themselves as the victim of a partner betrayal. Specifically, participants were asked to imagine themselves in a scenario (which we adapted from Boon & Sulsky, 1997) in which their romantic partner betrayed their trust by telling a mutual friend very private details about the participant's past. Participants in the *strong amends condition* read that their partner admitted his/her mistake, apologized, and tried

very hard to make up for it, whereas those in the *weak amends condition* read that their partner did not admit his/her mistake, did not apologize, and did not try at all to make up for it. Next, participants in the *high forgiveness condition* read that they decided to forgive their partner, whereas those in the *low forgiveness condition* read that they decided not to forgive their partner. After imagining themselves in the scenario, participants completed measures assessing the levels of self-respect and self-concept clarity they anticipated they would have if they had just gone through the described situation (“I would have a lot of respect for myself” and “I would have a clear sense of who I am and what I am,” respectively).

We conducted two analyses of variance (ANOVAs) with forgiveness and amends conditions as the between-subjects factors and with self-respect and self-concept clarity, in turn, as the dependent variable. Looking first at the main effects of victims’ and perpetrators’ behavior, in turn, on victims’ outcomes, there were marginally significant main effects of forgiveness, such that greater forgiveness caused lower anticipated self-respect and self-concept clarity. There were also significant main effects of amends, such that greater amends caused higher anticipated self-respect and self-concept clarity. Thus, there was some evidence that victims have actor control over their anticipated post-conflict self-respect and self-concept clarity—but that forgiving may have a *negative* effect on victims’ outcomes. And there was evidence that perpetrators have partner control over victims’ anticipated post-conflict self-respect and self-concept clarity.

Turning to the interaction effect of victims’ behavior and perpetrators’ behavior on victims’ outcomes, the effect of forgiveness on both self-respect and self-concept clarity depended on whether or not the perpetrator made amends. Descriptively speaking, participants who imagined offering forgiveness when their partner made amends reported they would experience higher self-respect and self-concept clarity than those who imagined withholding forgiveness when their partner made amends. In contrast, participants who imagined offering forgiveness

when their partner did not make amends reported they would experience lower self-respect and self-concept clarity than those who imagined withholding forgiveness when their partner did not make amends. Thus, victims and perpetrators share joint control over victims' anticipated post-conflict self-respect and self-concept clarity.

Although the Study 3 results established that forgiveness and amends *caused* the observed differences in anticipated levels of self-respect and self-concept clarity, hypothetical scenarios may seem artificial and participants' anticipated self-respect and self-concept clarity scores may reflect their theories of how they *should* view themselves in the described situation rather than how they actually *would* view themselves. Therefore, it remains important to examine associations among forgiveness, amends, self-respect, and self-concept clarity as they naturally occur following actual betrayals. We designed Study 4 to examine these associations.

#### Study 4

Study 4 was a longitudinal investigation in which 69 undergraduates involved in dating relationships completed 14 biweekly online questionnaires over six months. On each questionnaire, participants reported their self-respect and self-concept clarity ("I respect myself" and "In general, I have a clear sense of who I am and what I am," respectively). Later in the questionnaire, participants answered "yes" or "no" to the following question: "Has your partner done anything over the past two weeks that was upsetting to you?" Participants who answered "no" moved on to an unrelated set of questions. Those who answered "yes" completed measures assessing forgiveness ("I have forgiven my partner for this behavior"), amends ("My partner tried to make amends to me for this upsetting behavior"), and betrayal severity ("This behavior was highly distressing to me").

We conducted two sets of multilevel regression analyses predicting self-respect and self-concept clarity, in turn, from forgiveness, amends, and betrayal severity. Looking first at the main

effects of victims' and perpetrators' behavior, in turn, on victims' outcomes after severe betrayals, there were no significant main effects of forgiveness. But there were marginally significant main effects of amends, such that greater amends predicted higher self-respect and self-concept clarity. Thus, there was no evidence that victims have actor control over their post-conflict self-respect or self-concept clarity. But there was some evidence that perpetrators have partner control over victims' post-conflict self-respect and self-concept clarity.

Turning to the interaction effect of victims' behavior and perpetrators' behavior on victims' outcomes after severe betrayals, the association of forgiveness with both self-respect and self-concept clarity depended on the extent to which the perpetrator made amends. Increasing levels of forgiveness predicted more self-respect and self-concept clarity when the partner made strong amends for highly distressing betrayals. In contrast, descriptively speaking, increasing levels of forgiveness predicted less self-respect and self-concept clarity when the partner made weak amends for severe betrayals. Thus, victims and perpetrators share joint control over victims' post-conflict self-respect and self-concept clarity.

Study 4 complemented Studies 2 and 3 by examining prospective reports of forgiveness, amends, self-respect, and self-concept clarity following actual betrayals in ongoing relationships, and the Study 4 results showed that the associations of forgiveness with self-respect and self-concept clarity depend on the extent to which the perpetrator has made amends. Across the four studies, our hypothesis that victim's behavior and perpetrators' behavior wield joint control over victims' self-respect and self-concept clarity was supported strongly and consistently. Study 1 demonstrated that the association of marital forgiveness with trajectories of self-respect depends on spouse agreeableness, which is associated with making amends. Studies 2-4 demonstrated that the effect of forgiveness on self-respect and self-concept clarity depends on perpetrator amends. In addition, our two sub-hypotheses were supported: Forgiving bolsters one's self-respect and self-

concept clarity if the perpetrator tends to act in a generally agreeable manner or makes amends but diminishes one's self-respect and self-concept clarity if the perpetrator tends to act in a generally disagreeable manner or does not make amends. All 14 simple effects were in the predicted directions, but not all of them achieved statistical significance. Because obtaining statistically significant simple effects in opposite directions is a tall order for any given study, we conducted a meta-analysis to formally test whether or not the simple effects garnered reliable support across studies in this research program. (Study 1 was not included in the meta-analysis because change in self-respect over time, rather than absolute levels of self-respect, was the primary unit of analysis.)

#### Meta-Analysis of Studies 2-4

We calculated meta-analytic (a) main effects of forgiveness on self-respect and self-concept clarity, (b) main effects of amends on self-respect and self-concept clarity, (c) interaction effects of forgiveness and amends on self-respect and self-concept clarity, (d) simple effects of forgiveness on self-respect and self-concept clarity when the perpetrator made strong amends, and (e) simple effects of forgiveness on self-respect and self-concept clarity when the perpetrator made weak amends. Looking first at the main effects of victims' and perpetrators' behavior, in turn, on victims' outcomes, the meta-analysis revealed that, across studies, there were no significant main effects of forgiveness on self-respect or self-concept clarity. Thus, across studies, there was no evidence that victims have actor control over their post-conflict self-respect or self-concept clarity. This null result contrasts with the literature linking forgiveness to a variety of positive outcomes and fails to support the notion that forgiveness is a panacea. But there were significant main effects of amends, such that greater amends caused higher self-respect and self-concept clarity. Thus, across studies, there was evidence that perpetrators have partner control over victims' post-conflict self-respect and self-concept clarity.

Turning to the interaction effect of victims' behavior and perpetrators' behavior on victims' outcomes, the meta-analysis revealed that there were significant forgiveness  $\times$  amends interaction effects for both self-respect and self-concept clarity. The meta-analysis also provided strong support for both simple effects. Across Studies 2-4, forgiveness significantly bolstered self-respect and self-concept clarity when the perpetrator made strong amends, but forgiveness significantly diminished self-respect and self-concept clarity when the perpetrator made only weak amends. Thus, victims and perpetrators share joint control over victims' post-conflict outcomes, such that, if the perpetrator has made amends, forgiving increases one's self-respect and self-concept clarity, but if the perpetrator has not made amends, forgiving decreases one's self-respect and self-concept clarity.

The predicted means from the meta-analysis for victims' self-respect and self-concept clarity are presented in Figures 2 and 3, respectively. Calculating the amount of actor control, partner control, and joint control using the formulas presented in the Introduction confirms that victims' do not have complete control over their own outcomes. Rather, victims have a small and non-significant amount of actor control ( $-.21$  and  $-.20$  for self-respect and self-concept clarity, respectively); collapsing across levels of perpetrator amends, victims who forgive report an average of two-tenths of a scale point less self-respect and self-concept clarity than those who do not forgive. In contrast, perpetrators have a significant amount of partner control ( $.49$  and  $.46$  for self-respect and self-concept clarity, respectively); collapsing across levels of victim amends, victims who receive strong amends report an average of four- to five-tenths of a scale point more self-respect and self-concept clarity than those who receive only weak amends. Importantly, victims and perpetrators also share a significant amount of joint control ( $.60$  and  $.65$  for self-respect and self-concept clarity, respectively); victims who either forgive a perpetrator who made strong amends or do not forgive a perpetrator who made only weak amends report an average of

six- to seven-tenths of a scale point more self-respect and self-concept clarity than those who either forgive a perpetrator who made only weak amends or do not forgive a perpetrator who made strong amends.

#### Additional Evidence of Joint Control over Victims' Post-Conflict Outcomes

Two experiments and two longitudinal studies provided consistent evidence that victims and perpetrators share joint control over victims' post-conflict self-respect and self-concept clarity. Is there evidence that victims and perpetrators share joint control not only over victims' psychological health outcomes, such as self-respect and self-concept clarity, but also over victims' physical health outcomes and relational well-being? Yes. In a longitudinal study of married couples, McNulty (2008) found that, although individuals whose spouses rarely behaved negatively experienced more stable marital satisfaction over the first two years of marriage to the extent they were more forgiving, individuals whose spouses frequently behaved negatively experienced steeper declines in marital satisfaction to the extent they were more forgiving. That is, whether greater marital forgiveness predicted greater stability or steeper declines in marital satisfaction depended on how frequently one's spouse behaved badly, indicating that perpetrators and victims share joint control over victims' relational well-being.

Another study indicated that perpetrators and victims also may share joint control over victims' physical health outcomes. In a study of women at a domestic violence shelter, Gordon, Burton, and Porter (2004) found that those who reported the greatest forgiveness of their abusive partner were the most likely to report they intended to return to their partner. Returning to an abusive partner may well heighten the risk of being abused again, but whether or not returning to a previously abusive partner leads to further abuse depends on the perpetrator's behavior. The findings of the studies we described, together with the findings of McNulty (2008) and Gordon, Burton, and Porter (2004), suggest that victims and perpetrators share joint control over an array

of victims' outcomes, including their psychological health, physical health, and relational well-being.

### Concluding Remarks

Given that victims and perpetrators share joint control over victims' post-conflict outcomes, we assert that conflict resolution strategies designed to promote victims' forgiveness should aim to heighten victims' sensitivity to whether or not forgiveness is likely to be beneficial in their particular situation. Furthermore, forgiveness interventions should be supplemented with strategies designed to promote perpetrators' amend-making (e.g., the Victim Offender Reconciliation Program; see, for example, Green, 1984; Ristovski & Wertheim, 2005). Such "amends interventions" could adapt many of the methods used in forgiveness interventions, including helping perpetrators develop empathy for their victims, having perpetrators recall times they were hurt by others, and encouraging perpetrators to make a commitment to make amends for their misdeeds.

Moreover, because receiving amends facilitates forgiveness (e.g., McCullough, Worthington, & Rachal, 1997), interventions that successfully increase the extent to which perpetrators make amends may also increase the extent to which victims forgive. Past research has shown that, when perpetrators not only apologize, but also offer to compensate their victims for their offenses, victims are especially likely to forgive (Bottom, Gibson, Daniels, & Murnighan, 2002; Darby & Schlenker, 1982). Moreover, in an analysis of videotaped conflict discussions, perpetrator amends expressed during one 2-min segment was positively associated with victim forgiveness expressed during the following segment, controlling for forgiveness expressed in the initial segment (Hannon et al., in press).

Conflict resolutions strategies that successfully promote both perpetrator amends and victim forgiveness are optimal because they are likely to yield the most favorable outcomes. In all

four studies examining victims' post-conflict self-respect and self-concept clarity, victims' self-views were the most positive when they forgave perpetrators who had made amends. By recognizing that, just as two people are involved when a relationship ruptures, so, too, are two people involved in mending those ruptures, individuals who seek to heal their own or others' broken relationships might do so more successfully.

## References

- Bono, G., McCullough, M. E., & Root, L. M. (2008). Forgiveness, feeling connected to others, and well-being: Two longitudinal studies. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*, 182-195.
- Boon, S. D., & Sulsky, L. M. (1997). Attributions of blame and forgiveness in romantic relationships: A policy-capturing study. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 12*, 19-44.
- Bottom, W. P., Gibson, K., Daniels, S. E., & Murnighan, J. K. (2002). When talk is not cheap: Substantive penance and expressions of intent in rebuilding cooperation. *Organization Science, 13*(5), 498-513.
- Chiaramello, S., Sastre, M. T. M., & Mullet, E. (2008). Seeking forgiveness: Factor structure, and relationships with personality and forgiveness. *Personality and Individual Differences, 45*, 383-388.
- Darby, B. W., & Schlenker, B. R. (1982). Children's reactions to apologies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43*(4), 742-753.
- Gordon, K. C., Burton, S., & Porter, L. (2004). Predicting the intentions of women in domestic violence shelters to return to partners: Does forgiveness play a role? *Journal of Family Psychology, 18*, 331-338.
- Green, S. (1984). Victim-offender reconciliation program: A review of the concept. *Social Action & the Law, 10*, 43-52.
- Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. K. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 1464-1480.

Hannon, P. A., Rusbult, C. E., Finkel, E. J., & Kumashiro, M. (in press). In the wake of betrayal:

Amends, forgiveness, and the resolution of betrayal. *Personal Relationships*.

Hebl, J. H., & Enright, R. D. (1993). Forgiveness as a psychotherapeutic goal with elderly

females. *Psychotherapy, 30*, 658-667.

Jensen-Campbell, L. A., & Graziano, W. G. (2001). Agreeableness as a moderator of interpersonal

conflict. *Journal of Personality, 69*, 323-362.

Karremans, J. C., Van Lange, P. A. M., Ouwerkerk, J. W., & Kluwer, E. S. (2003). When

forgiving enhances psychological well-being: The roles of interpersonal commitment.

*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 1011-1026.

Kelley, H. H., Holmes, J. G., Kerr, N. L., Reis, H. T., Rusbult, C. E., & Van Lange, P. A. M.

(2003). *An atlas of interpersonal situations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kelley, H. H., & Thibaut, J. W. (1978). *Interpersonal relations: A theory of interdependence*. New

York: Wiley.

Luchies, L. B., Finkel, E. J., McNulty, J. K., & Kumashiro, M. (in press). The doormat effect:

When forgiving erodes self-respect and self-concept clarity. *Journal of Personality and*

*Social Psychology*.

McCullough, M. E. (2008). *Beyond revenge: The evolution of the forgiveness instinct*. San

Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McCullough, M. E., Orsulak, P., Brandon, A., & Akers, L. (2007). Rumination, fear, and cortisol:

An in vivo study of interpersonal transgressions. *Health Psychology, 26*(1), 126-132.

McCullough, M. E., Worthington, E. L., & Rachal, K. C. (1997). Interpersonal forgiving in close

relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 321-336.

McNulty, J. K. (2008). Forgiveness in marriage: Putting the benefits into context. *Journal of*

*Family Psychology, 22*, 171-175.

- Orcutt, H. K. (2006). The prospective relationship of interpersonal forgiveness and psychological distress symptoms among college women. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*, 350-361.
- Ristovski, A., & Wertheim, E. H. (2005). Investigation of compensation source, trait empathy, satisfaction with outcome and forgiveness in the criminal context. *Australian Psychologist, 40*, 63-69.
- Rye, M. S., & Pargament, K. I. (2002). Forgiveness and romantic relationships in college: Can it heal the wounded heart? *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 54*, 419-441.
- Sandage, S. J., Worthington, E. L., Hight, T. L., & Berry, J. W. (2000). Seeking forgiveness: Theoretical context and an initial empirical study. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 28*, 21-35.
- Singer, J.D., & Willett, J.B. (2003). *Applied longitudinal data analysis*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Tsang, J., McCullough, M. E., & Fincham, F. D. (2006). The longitudinal association between forgiveness and relationship closeness and commitment. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 25*(4), 448-472.
- Wade, N. G., & Worthington, E. L. (2005). In search of a common core: A content analysis of interventions to promote forgiveness. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 42*, 160-177.
- Waltman, M. A., Russell, D. C., Coyle, C. T., Enright, R. D., Holter, A. C., & Swoboda, C. M. (2009). The effects of a forgiveness intervention on patients with coronary artery disease. *Psychology and Health, 24*, 11-27.
- Worthington, E. L., Kurusu, T. A., Collins, W., Berry, J. W., Ripley, J. S., & Baier, S. B. (2000). Forgiving usually takes time: A lesson learned by studying interventions to promote forgiveness. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 28*, 3-20.

Figure 1. How to calculate actor control, partner control, and joint control over victims' post-conflict outcomes.

		Victim	
		Forgive	Do Not Forgive
Perpetrator	Make Amends	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>
	Do Not Make Amends	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>

Actor Control =  $((A + C) - (B + D)) / 2$

Partner Control =  $((A + B) - (C + D)) / 2$

Joint Control =  $((A + D) - (B + C)) / 2$

Figure 2. Actor control, partner control, and joint control over victims' meta-analyzed post-conflict self-respect. Table values in bold are raw scores on a 1-7 scale. Table values in parenthesis are standardized scores.

		Victim	
		Forgive	Do Not Forgive
Perpetrator	Make Amends	<b>4.63</b> (0.25)	<b>4.23</b> (0.03)
	Do Not Make Amends	<b>3.53</b> (-0.37)	<b>4.34</b> (0.09)

$$\text{Actor Control} = ((4.63 + 3.53) - (4.23 + 4.34)) / 2 = -.21$$

$$\text{Partner Control} = ((4.63 + 4.23) - (3.53 + 4.34)) / 2 = .49$$

$$\text{Joint Control} = ((4.63 + 4.34) - (4.23 + 3.53)) / 2 = .60$$

Figure 3. Actor control, partner control, and joint control over victims' meta-analyzed post-conflict self-concept clarity. Table values in bold are raw scores on a 1-7 scale. Table values in parenthesis are standardized scores.

		Victim	
		Forgive	Do Not Forgive
Perpetrator	Make Amends	<b>4.86</b> (0.29)	<b>4.40</b> (0.00)
	Do Not Make Amends	<b>3.74</b> (-0.42)	<b>4.59</b> (0.12)

$$\text{Actor Control} = ((4.86 + 3.74) - (4.40 + 4.59)) / 2 = -.20$$

$$\text{Partner Control} = ((4.86 + 4.40) - (3.74 + 4.59)) / 2 = .46$$

$$\text{Joint Control} = ((4.86 + 4.59) - (4.40 + 3.74)) / 2 = .65$$