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Have you ever thought what forgiveness means?

You, your own self, your own personality; needs your forgiveness.

Your spirit is divine, but until you have overcome,

Your personality remains human and needs the forgiveness of your spirit.

As you forgive, as your spirit forgives your personality, so also you will learn to forgive your brother man for all his seeming errors.

If you will train yourself to think in terms of love and forgiveness every moment of your life, a most beautiful healing will take place within you.


In loving memory of all those who have forgiven, have to forgive and want to be forgiven. It is dedicated to the vivid memories and images of those women that I have lost to death, but still remember their very kind hearted, forgiving and humourous nature. In my heart you’ll remain. May ALLAH grant all of you, JANNATOEL FIRDOUZ (Paradise).

Insha’Allah
Abstract

Aim: The aim of this study was to understand, explore and investigate the personality (using Eysenck’s three personality traits of Psychoticism, Neuroticism and Extraversion) and demographic factors (age, gender, religion, marital status and educational status) predicting willingness to forgive among Mafikeng residents. The hypotheses investigated were 1: that personality factors (P, E and N) will influence people’s willingness to forgive. 2: that demographic variables (such as age, being religious, marital status and one’s level of education) of participants will influence their willingness to forgive.

Method: Through a convenience sampling method, data were collected from a sample of 250 residents living in Mafikeng, North West Province. The design of the study was cross-sectional. Copies of a questionnaire containing three sections (A, B and C) were given out to participants. Section A measured the demographic determinants of the respondents, Section B measured aspects of the respondents’ personality such as Psychoticism (P), Extraversion (E) and Neuroticism (N). Section C measured the willingness to forgive of the respondents. Respondents ranged between 18 and 68 years with a mean age of 28.4 (SD= 12.3). Forty percent were males and 60 % were females.

Results: Hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to examine the relative contribution of personality and demographic variables. Results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis using the stepwise method showed that the overall model was significant, adjusted R square = .089, F (2, 211) = 11.460, P< .001. Thus, Extraversion and Post- Matric variables explained 8% of the total variance on willingness to forgive. Both hypotheses were partially supported since the only factors
able to predict willingness to forgive as indicated by Table 2 was Extraversion (E) a personality factor and Post-Matric (a demographic factor, one’s educational level).

**Conclusion:** The study concluded that while people with Post Matric level of education and extraverted people tend to forgive, there is still a need to investigate personality trait variables in future studies.
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CHAPTER 1
GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1. INTRODUCTION

As we are imperfect human beings, it is part of human nature that we are prone to hurt and offend one another, whether it is someone closely related to us or not. This hurt or offense can be caused intentionally as well as unintentionally. McCullough, Fincham, & Tsang (2003), and McCullough, Exline, & Baumeister (1998) state that in many cases, painful hurts, experiences of being hurt or offended by someone is likely to lead to negative thoughts, feelings and actions towards the offender by the offended. The ultimate manner in which to let go of these feelings of animosity which can lead to poor health as shown by research, is to forgive. Forgiveness may occur, however, it does not necessarily mean reconciling with the transgressor.

The concept of forgiveness has been rated as one of the most original ideas in world civilization (Arendt, 1958). Although there has been an increased interest in this topic in the last two decades, this phenomenon has, hitherto been neglected in the psychological literature and research, especially regarding the experience of forgiveness in everyday life and how the individual integrates this experience into his or her view of himself or herself and the world.

Many definitions of forgiveness have been developed. According to McCullough, Root, Berry, Tabak and Bono (2007), researchers have defined forgiveness in different ways, but all of their definitions are based on the idea that forgiveness involves temporal change by which people’s feelings and motivations toward people who have harmed them become more positive and less negative. Enright, Gassin, and Wu (1992), for instance, defined forgiveness as “the overcoming of negative affect and judgement toward the offender, not by denying
ourselves the right to such affect and judgement, but by endeavouring to view the offender with compassion, benevolence, and love...” while recognizing that he or she has abandoned the right to them (Wilson, 1994, p.101). Exline and Baumeister (2000) defined forgiveness as the “cancellation of a debt” by “the person who has been hurt or wronged”. Finally, McCullough, Worthington, and Rachal (1997) defined forgiveness as “the set of motivational changes whereby one becomes (a) decreasingly motivated to retaliate against an offending relationship partner; (b) decreasingly motivated to maintain estrangement from the offender; and (c) increasingly motivated by conciliation and goodwill for the offender, despite the offender’s hurtful actions”.

Forgiveness has long been in the writings of religious books. According to McCullough, Fincham and Tsang (2003), the concept of forgiveness has long been a focus of the world’s religions (McCullough & Worthington, 1999; Rye, Pargament, Ali, Beck, Dorff, Hallisey, Narayanan & Williams, 2000), but only during the last decade did psychologists develop a sustained interest in the topic (Enright & Fitzgibbons, 2000; Enright & North, 1998; McCullough, Exline & Baumeister, 1998; McCullough, Pargament & Thoresen, 2000; Worthington, 1998a).

Self-reports of forgiveness have been consistently related to higher levels of religiousness (McCullough, Bono, & Root, 2005; Tsang, McCullough, & Hoyt, 2005). Recent research linked intrinsic religious motivation with lower scores on self-reported vengefulness (and extrinsic religious motivation was associated with higher levels), but also suggested that some aspects of traditional religiousness may be associated with behavioural retaliations (Greer, Berman, Varan, Bobrycki, & Watson, 2005).
Understandings of what forgiveness means and requires are profoundly shaped by people’s core beliefs and values (Mahoney, Rye & Pargament, 2005). On a broad scale, people who self-identify as religious—rather than “spiritual”—consistently score as having more forgiving personalities than those who self-identify as spiritual—rather than “religious” (DeShea, Tzou, Kang & Matsuyuki, 2006). In comparing religions, Cohen, Malka, Rozin and Cherfas (2006) found that protestant Christians and Jews differed in their understanding of and approaches to forgiveness, with Jews more likely to believe that some offences are unforgivable, and to endorse theological reasons for this belief.

Recent works have shed light on the social-psychological precursors to forgiveness (Exline & Baumeister, 2000; Fincham, 2000; Finkel, Rusbult, Kumashiro & Hannon, 2002). They also include the personality process underlying forgiveness (McCullough, 2001; McCullough & Hoyt, 2002), the process by which reasoning about forgiveness develops as people age (Enright, Santos & Al Mabuk, 1989; Mullet & Girard, 2000), the effects of forgiveness on physiological parameters such as blood pressure and respiration (Witvliet, Ludwig & Van der Laan, 2001), and even the efficacy of clinical interventions for promoting forgiveness (Enright & Coyle, 1998; Worthington & Drinkard, 2000).

Previous research about the impact of forgiveness and the benefits thereof conducted by researchers (e.g., McCullough, Root & Cohen, 2006; Karremans & Van Lange, 2004) have shown that not only forgiving another but the experience of forgiving oneself is common, profound and vital to one’s sense of health, human growth and psychological wholeness. As a conceptual problem, forgiveness has roots in theology, philosophy and psychology because forgiveness is an interdisciplinary issue and philosophers and theologians often base their interpretations on observations of specific human behaviour. Theologically forgiveness
cannot be understood outside of the context of God's forgiveness. From a philosophical perspective, ethicists and legal philosophers have engaged in lively debate about the nature and moral value for forgiveness (e.g., Derrida, 2001; Govier, 2002; Holmgren, 1993). Much of these writings address prescriptive issues, with the aim of identifying conditions under which forgiveness is morally appropriate. Philosophical analyses of forgiveness find their place alongside related writings on the moral value of retribution and revenge (French, 2001; Moore, 1987; Murphy, 2000). From a psychological view, Bonar (1989), contends that the need for forgiveness can be explained within every major system of psychology. Psychological definitions of forgiveness tend to focus on forgiveness as an action or an attitude on the part of the forgiver, benefits of forgiving and the role of forgiveness in psychotherapy and something that brings about psychological well-being. Enright and Fitzgibbons (2000), state that one needs to adopt an interdisciplinary approach in order to understand the multifaceted nature and deeper meaning of forgiveness.

Social psychologists have devoted extensive empirical attention to the precursors of forgiveness, thereby focusing on personality factors, relationship factors, and offense specific factors that determine the level of forgiveness (McCullough, Pargament, & Thoresen, 2000).

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, there was an ongoing debate about the different structural models that describe the human personality. To date, the most widely used and investigated of these models are that of Eysenck (Eysenck’s three-factor model), and the five-factor model. These models have been largely replicated across different languages and cultures (Eysenck & Haapasalo 1989; Hanin, Eysenck, Eysenck & Barrett, 1991; Kallasmaa, Allik, Realo & McCrae, 2000; McCrae & Costa, 1997; Pulver, Allik, Pulkkinen &
Hamalainen, 1995), creating even more attention than Cattell’s (1957), and Guildford-Zimmerman’s (1956) personality models.

The Two dimensions defining the most basic and parsimonious personality structure are extraversion and neuroticism. The first historical view of these dimensions was provided by the Hippocrates Humoral theory.

To explain how personality-forgiveness associations arise, personality traits (for example, traits like neuroticism and agreeableness) can be conceptualized as filters that shape one’s perceptions of the transgressor (McCullough & Hoyt, 2002)—particularly, perceptions of the transgressors’ careworthiness, value, and safety. For example, an explanation for the inverse relationship of Neuroticism and forgiveness (Brose, rye, lutz-Zois & Ross, 2005) is that neuroticism makes transgressions feel more severe (McCullough & Hoyt, 2002). When people feel as though they have already endured a lot of pain, they may view forgiveness as compromising their safety or requiring psychological energy they do not have. Furthermore, because Neuroticism makes transgressions seem more painful, it also may limit the perception that the relationship with the transgressor will have value in the future, which would make the prospect of a renewed relationship with the transgressor less motivating.

1.2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Hayner (2000) states that in the last 25 years worldwide, there have been over 20 Truth Commissions. Specifically in South Africa the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) was established as a result of both the political and racial injustices and conflicts of the past. The aim of the TRC was to try and resolve these past conflicts. They attempted to do so by
allowing the offenders to come forward and plead for forgiveness from those that they had transgressed.

However, studies on forgiveness have primarily been conducted in Europe and America (Friesen, Fletcher & Overall, 2005), and only a few have been conducted in Africa and other developing societies. Even with the fewer studies that have been conducted in the developing world, very little attention has been focussed on the personality and demographic factors predicting willingness to forgive among residents of a certain area. This is the rationale for this study.

1.3. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In an attempt to explore and understand personality and the demographic factors predicting willingness to forgive among Mafikeng residents, the study aimed to answer the following questions:

1. Whether personalities e.g. Psychoticism, Extraversion and Neuroticism determine people’s willingness to forgive?
2. Whether demographic variables e.g. age, gender, being religious, marital status and one’s level of education will predict willingness to forgive.

1.4. AIM OF THE STUDY

The aim of the study was to explore, investigate and understand the personality and demographic factors (age, gender, religion, marital status and educational status) predicting willingness to forgive among Mafikeng residents.
1.5. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of this study are:

- To understand the personality and demographic factors of willingness to forgive among Mafikeng residents.
- To understand how personality impacts on the willingness to forgive among Mafikeng residents.
- To understand if demographic determinants play any role in the willingness to forgive among Mafikeng residents.

1.6. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Specifically, the present study sought to explore and investigate the personality and demographic factors (age, gender, religion, marital status and educational status) predicting willingness to forgive among Mafikeng residents and it is of importance because:

Firstly, very few studies if any, have explored the personality and demographic factors of forgiveness, especially in everyday life experiences. The study aimed to fill this gap.

Secondly, the documentation of the personality and demographic factors predicting willingness to forgive among Mafikeng residents may give insight into how they view relationships and even lead to developments in forgiveness programmes and therapy.

Thirdly, most of the past researches on forgiveness have been of a qualitative nature. Therefore, the quantitative nature of this study is an attempt to contribute statistically to the field of research.
This study will also benefit other researchers and institutions in terms of which areas of research to focus on. Theoretically, several theories discussed briefly below have been applied and adapted to some variables of this study.

Furthermore, almost no research has been conducted about personality and demographic factors predicting willingness to forgive specifically in the North West Province and among residents of Mafikeng. The reason for the choice of community for the study was because it was an area of interest for the researcher, as it is not an area that has often been studied and that the researcher wanted to get an idea of the views of forgiveness and peoples’ likelihood to favour revenge. Thus, perhaps if people thought about how they perceive forgiveness and were willing to forgive, less conflict, hostility and fewer divisions amongst people would exist.

1.7. OVERVIEW OF THE THESIS

Chapter one provides a brief overview of the study, its aim and objectives. Chapter two is a definition of the central concepts and a discussion of the theoretical perspectives that are employed as the theoretical framework in this study. In the first section of Chapter Three, literature related to forgiveness, personality and demographic factors is discussed and the research hypotheses are explained. In Chapter Four, the research methodology that has been used in this study is discussed. The results of the study are presented in Chapter Five. In Chapter Six, the results of the study are discussed. The last part of Chapter Six gives a summary of the findings, including the limitations of the study and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2
OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter aims to discuss the operational definitions of the variables involved in the study as well as, discuss the theoretical perspectives that are of relevance to the study and employ them to theoretically formulate the study.

2.2. OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

2.2.1. Willingness to forgive: in this study, refers to scores obtained on the Willingness to forgive scale by de Shea (2003). A high score indicates willingness to forgive and being ready, eager or prepared to forgive while a low score is unwillingness to forgive.

2.2.2. Forgive: to forgive is defined as, stop feeling angry or resentful towards someone for an offence or mistake. No longer feel angry about or wish to punish an offence or mistake (Paperback Oxford English Dictionary, 2005).

2.2.3. Personality: is often defined as an organized combination of attributes, motives, values, and behaviours unique to each individual (Sigelman & Rider, 2009), and in this study, is defined as scores obtained on the EPQ scale. EPQ covers extraversion, psychoticism and neuroticism. The Extrovert is an outgoing, socially confident person while the neurotic is a person who is excessively sensitive, anxious or obsessive. Eysenck’s (1993) description of psychoticism states that a person will exhibit some qualities commonly found among psychotics and that they may be more susceptible, given certain environments, to becoming
psychotic. Examples of such psychotic tendencies include recklessness, disregard for common sense and inappropriate emotional expression, to name a few (Boeree, 1998).

2.3. THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

2.3.1. Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA)

The association between forgiveness and the willingness to forgive can be linked to many humanistic, behavioural and existential traditions in psychology. One theory that has been extensively covered in psychological literature is the Theory of Reasoned Action which was developed by Ajzen and Fishbein (1980). In this theory, a person's attitude toward behaviour consists of a belief that that particular behaviour leads to a certain outcome and an evaluation of the outcome of that behaviour. If the outcome seems beneficial to the individual, he or she may then intend to or actually participate in a particular behaviour. Also included in one's attitude toward behaviour is the individual's concept of the subjective norm (an individual's perception of what others around them believe that they should do). The people around us strongly influence whether or not we partake or intend to partake in any behaviour. Furthermore, people may also be inclined (or not inclined) to participate in a behaviour based upon their desire to comply with others. In a nutshell, the theory explains that ultimately, one's attitude toward behaviour can lead to an intention to act (or not to act as the case may be). This intention may or may not lead to a particular behaviour.
The figure below is an illustration of the theory of reasoned action as conceived by Ajzen and Fishbein (1975).

![The person's beliefs that the behavior leads to certain outcomes and higher evaluations of these outcomes](image)

*Figure 1. Reasoned Action Model – Ajzen & Fishbein, 1975*

Based on this theory, forgiveness could be interpreted to mean that an individual’s perception of forgiveness, will lead to his or her willingness to forgive.

### 2.3.2. A Search for Meaning

Frankl’s (1969) theory explains that human beings have a capacity for self-transcendence. Frankl made the point that acquiring meaning in life is the same as mental health. Frankl states that if meaning is not found then an existential vacuum will prevail. Failing to acquire meaning can lead to feelings such as apathy, boredom, and emptiness.

According to Frankl (1959), positive psychological adjustment is the result of finding meaning in life and particularly in unavoidable suffering. He purports three types of values that allow humans to find purpose in life, namely creativity, experience and attitude. Creativity refers to the kind of products a person gives to society. Experience refers to the products that an individual takes from society, and attitude refers to the kind of stand that a person takes when faced with situations that are unchangeable. It is when the attitude during suffering is appropriate and enhanced sense of meaning is found in the hurtful situation which results in a positive transformation within the person who has suffered. This model emphasizes the role of finding meaning in suffering and forgiving.

### 2.3.3. Eysenck’s theory of personality

According to Hergenhahn & Olson (2003), for Eysenck, it was not enough to establish a measurement system and taxonomy of personality types. His quest to interrelate test scores, behaviour and the underlying biological mechanisms with empirical data makes his contribution to personality theory both unique and historically important.
Hergenhahn & Olson (2003), state that in Eysenck’s first attempt to develop a biological explanation of personality, he adopted ideas from the Russian researcher who discovered classical conditioning, Ivan Pavlov, and an American neo behaviourist, Clark Hull. In early theorizing, Eysenck (1957) utilized concepts that were inferred from behaviour rather than actually demonstrated in research. For example, Pavlov’s explanation of classical conditioning relied heavily on his theoretical ideas about brain processes called excitation and inhibition. Eysenck borrowed from Pavlov’s work and wrote in his typological postulate:

Individuals in whom excitatory potential is generated slowly and in whom excitatory potentials so generated are relatively weak, are thereby predisposed to develop extraverted [sic] patterns of behaviour...individuals in whom excitatory potentials so generated are strong, are thereby predisposed to develop introverted patterns of behaviour (1957: 114).

Eysenck’s ideas about inhibition were greatly influenced by Hull’s learning theory. Hull used the concept of reactive inhibition to explain phenomena like experimental extinction in which we observe decreased performance of a response. Basically, reactive inhibition is caused by fatigue—either muscular or neural and acts to inhibit responding. Regarding the role of inhibition in personality, Eysenck (1957) continued in his typological postulate:

Similarly, individuals in whom reactive inhibition is developed quickly, in whom strong reactive inhibitions are generated, and in whom reactive inhibition is dissipated slowly, are thereby predisposed to develop extraverted [sic] patterns of behaviour...conversely, individuals in whom reactive inhibition is developed slowly,
in whom weak reactive inhibitions are generated, and in whom reactive inhibition is 
dissipated quickly, are thereby predisposed to develop introverted patterns of 
behaviour (p.114).

According to Hergenhahn & Olson (2003), “Eysenck consistently rejected any theory, 
including his own, that was contradicted by empirical excitation/inhibition. When the theories 
proved disappointing he turned to the arousal theory, which is based on well-documented 
brain processes. His use of arousal theory preserves the essential idea that the introvert’s 
brain is characterized by higher levels of neutral activity, and it improves on the earlier theory 
by providing an explanation for the neuroticism/ stability (N) dimension of personality”.

Eysenck’s theory is based primarily on physiology and genetics. Inspite of him being a 
behaviourist who considered learned habits as being of great importance, he considered 
personality differences as growing out of our genetic inheritance. He, is therefore, primarily 
interested in what is usually called temperament.

Temperament is that aspect of our personalities that is genetically based, inborn, there from 
birth or, even before. That does not mean that a temperament theory says we do not also have 
aspects of our personality that are learned, it’s just that Eysenck focused on “nature,” and left 
“ nurture” to other theorists (The Eysenck Personality Questionnaire - EPQ. Retrieved 

Eysenck initially conceptualized personality as two, biologically-based categories of 
temperament:
• Extraversion/Introversion

Extraversion is characterized by being outgoing, talkative, high on positive affect (feeling good), and in need of external stimulation. According to Eysenck’s arousal theory of extraversion, there is an optimal level of cortical arousal, and performance deteriorates as one becomes more or less aroused than this optimal level. Arousal can be measured by skin conductance, brain waves or sweating. At very low and very high levels of arousal, performance is low, but at more optimal mid-level of arousal, performance is maximized. Extroverts, according to Eysenck’s theory, are chronically under-aroused and bored and are therefore in need of external stimulation to bring them up to an optimal level of performance. Introverts, on the other hand, are chronically over-aroused and jittery and are therefore in need of peace and quiet to bring them up to an optimal level of performance (The Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ). Retrieved February 10, 2010, from www.trans4mind.co.za).

• Neuroticism/Stability

Neuroticism or emotionality is characterized by high levels of negative affect such as depression and anxiety. Neuroticism, according to Eysenck’s theory, is based on activation thresholds in the sympathetic nervous system or visceral brain. This is the part of the brain that is responsible for the fight-or-flight response in the face of danger. Activation can be measured by heart rate, blood pressure, cold hands, sweating and muscular tension (especially in the forehead). Neurotic people, who have low activation thresholds, and are unable to inhibit or control their emotional reactions, experience negative affect (fight-or-flight) in the face of very minor stressors-they are easily nervous or upset. Emotionally stable people, who have high activation thresholds and good emotional control, experience negative affect only in the face of very major stressors- they are calm and collected under pressure (The Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ). Retrieved February 10, 2010, from
www.trans4mind.co.za). High Neuroticism is a predictor of a low tendency to forgive others, as well as many psychiatric disorders and lower psychological well-being (Hettema, Neale, Myers, Prescott, & Kendler, 2006).

The two dimensions or axes, extraversion-introversion and emotional stability-instability, define four quadrants. These are made up of:

- **Stable extraverts** (sanguine qualities such as-outgoing, talkative, responsive, easygoing, lively, carefree, leadership).
- **Unstable extraverts** (choleric qualities such as- touchy, restless, excitable, changeable, impulsive, irresponsible).
- **Stable introverts** (Phlegmatic qualities such as- calm, even-tempered, reliable, controlled, peaceful, thoughtful, careful and passive).
- **Unstable introverts** (Melancholic qualities such as quiet, reserved, pessimistic, sober, rigid, anxious and moody).
Figure 2. Personality and Individual differences

Further research demonstrated the need for a third category of temperament:

- **Psychoticism/Socialisation**

Psychoticism was then developed. It is associated not only with the liability to have a psychotic episode (or break with reality), but also with aggression. Psychotic behaviour is rooted in the characteristics of toughmindedness, non-conformity, inconsideration, recklessness, hostility, anger and impulsiveness.

The Table below describes the traits that are associated with the three temperaments in Eysenck’s model of personality:

*Table 1.A. Eysenck’s model of personality*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychoticism</th>
<th>Extraversion</th>
<th>Neuroticism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>Sociable</td>
<td>Anxious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>Irresponsible</td>
<td>Depressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>Guilt Feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsympathetic</td>
<td>Lack of reflection</td>
<td>Low self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulative</td>
<td>Sensation-seeking</td>
<td>Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement-oriented</td>
<td>Impulsive</td>
<td>Moody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogmatic</td>
<td>Risk-taking</td>
<td>Hypochondriac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>Lack of autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tough-minded</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Obsessive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, Hans Eysenck described extraversion-introversion as the degree to which a person is outgoing and interactive with other people. Extroverts seek excitement and social activity in an effort to heighten their arousal level, whereas introverts tend to avoid social situations in an effort to keep such arousal to a minimum. Eysenck originally suggested that extraversion was a combination of two major tendencies, impulsiveness and sociability.

There is also a difference in behaviour among introverts and extroverts. According to one study, extraverts tend to wear more decorative clothing, whereas introverts prefer practical, comfortable clothes. Extraverts are likely to prefer more upbeat, conventional and energetic music than introverts. Personality also influences how people arrange their work areas. In general, extraverts decorate their offices more whereas, introverts in contrast are less decorative.

2.4. THEORETICAL FORMULATION

The perspectives discussed above are discussed within the theoretical framework for the personality and demographic factors predicting willingness to forgive among residents. This study focuses on exploring, investigating and understanding the personality and demographic factors predicting willingness to forgive among Mafikeng residents.

2.4.1. Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA)

Based on the theory of reasoned action, it could be that someone had committed a transgression or offence against you and that your beliefs, feelings and thoughts and your evaluations of the outcome of this behaviour will lead to your behaviour towards the transgressor and you compare what you would do with the subjective norm e.g. Perhaps your religion prescribes forgiveness and how you should respond to the offense or transgressor. In
such a case, it is more likely that age, gender, religion and personality would seem to play a large role in what the individual would decide based on the subjective norm in the environment where he or she lives. Basically, in this context, whether one is willing to forgive or not will depend on your own beliefs regarding forgiveness and that which is considered as the subjective norm.

2.4.2. A Search for Meaning

Willingness to forgive and its various outcomes can also be linked to Frankl’s (1969) search for meaning. Therefore, in terms of the present research, it can be argued that if an individual who is faced with the predicament to forgive or not is able to create meaning in his life, if he has a good concept of forgiveness then he is likely to be willing to forgive and can be protected from the problems associated with being unforgiving.

According to Von Krosigk (2000), the literature on forgiveness purports claims for the benefits of forgiveness to the forgiver, the offender and their relationship. Forgiving is assumed to change the way in which the offended individual views the offence and the offender, to positively change the emotions associated with the offence and to encourage the offended towards reconciliation.

Thus, with regards to Frankl’s (1969) theory, by finding meaning in the suffering that one has experienced and not allowing an existential vacuum to prevail, then one is more likely to forgive.

Furthermore, based on the three types of values namely, creativity, experience and attitude, which Frankl purports and says, allow humans to find purpose in life. In a situation where in
the aspect of creativity one does something positive for someone or contributes positively
towards a relationship you have and you receive negativity and betrayal from that same
person, or even perhaps the person has committed a transgression towards you that you
perceive as unforgivable then the attitude or situation that you are likely to be faced with is
whether to forgive the person or not. As stated earlier, when the attitude during suffering is
appropriate and enhanced and a sense of meaning is found in the hurtful situation then
positive transformation results within the person who has suffered, in this situation it means
that the individual will be more willing to forgive.

2.4.3. Eysenck’s Personality Questionnaire

In this context it would seem that one’s ability to forgive is also influenced by your
personality. Eysenck’s theory describes the characteristics of extraversion/ introversion,
neuroticism and psychoticism. Stable extroverts are said to be, responsive, easy going and
carefree. Unstable extroverts are said to be touchy, irresponsible and impulsive. Stable
introverts are said to be, calm, thoughtful, careful and even-tempered whereas, unstable
introverts are quiet, reserved, pessimistic, rigid, anxious and moody. It seems that it would be
more likely that a person who has a stable extroverted personality is more likely to be willing
to forgive in comparison with an unstable extrovert. Stable introverts seem to be more willing
to forgive than unstable introverts based on the characteristics that they are said to possess.

Neurotic people with low activation thresholds are unable to inhibit or control their emotional
reactions, experience negative affect in the pace of very minor stressors and they are easily
nervous or upset. Emotionally stable people who are the opposite of neurotics and have a
high activation threshold and good emotional control, experience negative affect only in the
face of very major stressors, they are calm and collected. Under pressure, high neuroticism is
a predictor of a low tendency to forgive others, as well as many psychiatric disorders and lower psychological well-being (Hettema, Neale, Myers, Prescott, & Kendler, 2006). Thus, people who are highly neurotic are less likely to forgive and those who are emotionally stable are more likely to be willing to forgive.

Psychoticism has been said to be rooted in characteristics of toughmindedness, non-conformity, inconsideration, anger and impulsiveness. Such people seem to be more likely not to be willing to forgive. Furthermore, these are more likely to be antisocial people and criminals.

The present study adopts the Eysenck Personality Model (1957), as it explains the three aspects of personality that comprise Eysenck’s Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) and the characteristics of each personality type and how people with these personality types are likely to behave. This could act as a predictor of whether an individual will be willing to forgive or not. Variables in this model help explain variables in the current study. These are the personality factors predicting willingness to forgive.

2.5. SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

This chapter aimed at defining the central concepts used in the study as well as discuss theoretical perspectives relevant to the topic and formulate the study according to these perspectives.
CHAPTER 3
LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

3.1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to review and discuss recent literature with regard to forgiveness. In the first section of the review, the theological perspectives on forgiveness is discussed with a focus on the religious aspect. The second section focuses on forgiveness as a political project, particularly in the South African context. Studies conducted on various demographic factors (age, gender, marital status, religion and educational level) and forgiveness are also discussed. This is followed by a final section that explains the research hypotheses that were developed for this study. The chapter is concluded by giving a summary of the topics that were discussed.

The concept of forgiveness brings various images, emotions and thoughts to mind as for example, those who have been betrayed and possess thoughts of revenge and hatred and those who have been forgiven, forgotten and gotten on with their lives. Others that also come to mind are those people who want to or need to forgive or be forgiven by another because of what they have said or done which had caused pain.

In spite of being faced with the dilemma to forgive or not, things are made much more complicated because of the fact that in our daily lives we continuously interact with other people and this is a learning process of trial and error. What seems the right way in one situation might be the wrong way in another and what leads to forgiveness in one situation may not be relevant in another situation. Individuals differ in many respects and where the one needs and wants an explanation and an apology, another expects a silent acceptance of
angry reprimands. Where the one wants to talk it over, another needs to work it through alone accompanied by silence.

3.2. THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES ON FORGIVENESS

Although forgiveness may be the core of religions, religious systems often differ in their views about when to forgive. For example, many Jews view repentance and atonement as prerequisites for forgiveness, whereas Christians commonly believe that forgiveness should be unconditional. Scholars from various fields have taken steps to articulate how forgiveness is viewed within various major faith traditions in the past two decades. Research has shown that people who are more religious tend to value forgiveness more than those who are less religious (Rokeach, 1973; Shoemaker & Bolt, 1977). A study conducted by Rye, Pargament, Ali, Beck, Dorff, Hallisey, Narayanan and Williams (2000) compared Jewish, Christian, Muslim, Buddhist and Hindu perspectives on forgiveness.

3.2.1. Judaism: In the Jewish faith, if the transgressor has gone through the process of teshuvah, or “return”, which requires the expression of remorse and compensation to the victim, as well as a commitment from the transgressor to refrain from repeating the offence, it becomes obligatory for the individual to forgive. Reconciliation (i.e., the actual restoration of the broken relationship) is not a necessary part of the forgiveness process (Rye et al., 2000). In the Jewish tradition, if an offender asks a victim for forgiveness publicly three times, and the victim refuses to forgive, then the victim becomes an offender too. Furthermore, in the Jewish faith there is a religious law that demands Jews to forgive others. Jewish scriptures and the Jewish holy book called the Talmud mentions this law (Rye et al., 2000). On The Day of Atonement, called Yom Kippur, which is the most important day in the Jewish calendar, Jewish people are supposed to ask others for forgiveness. According to this tradition, in order
to receive God’s forgiveness, one should first be forgiven by those whom he or she has offended. In this context, human forgiveness is therefore seen to be intertwined with divine forgiveness.

3.2.2. Christianity: Witvliet (2001), states that as in Judaism, Christianity considers forgiveness to be foundational to its doctrine. Also similar to Judaism, Christian believers are encouraged to forgive because God forgave them (Enright et al., 1992). However, unlike Judaism, forgiveness is not conditional upon the transgressor’s repentance (Rye et al., 2000). Whilst the Christian scriptures have many references to forgiveness, the one popular example of forgiveness is when Jesus requested God to forgive those who crucified him because “they do not know what they are doing” (Luke 23:34, Holy Bible).

3.2.3. Islam: Forgiveness is also of great importance in Islam (Ayoub, 1997). In fact, one of Allah’s appellations is Al-Ghafoor, the Forgiving One, who cancels debts of wrongdoing against God or any part of the creation. Rye et al., (2000) state that in Islam an offence may necessarily not be against a human being, a group of people or a society, or even against any part of the non-human world, namely, plants, animals, air or water. The concept of forgiveness in the Qur’aan, the holy book of Islam, is expressed by three Arabic terms denoting first, pardon; second, turning away from a sin or a misdeed; and finally, remitting, covering, or forgiving a wrong.

Islam stresses that those who desire to be forgiven for their wrongs must forgive others for theirs. Forgiveness is not only important for the afterlife, to be forgiven by Allah for our sins, but it is also seen to bring happiness in the present life by improving relationships with other people. Though Islam allows revenge for the extent of the harm done, it however prefers
Muslims to forgive instead of taking the path of revenge since it is possible to go too far with revenge. Among Muslims, reconciliation is desirable but does not have to follow from forgiveness if the offender has serious defects of character. More importantly, an individual has to stay in contact with the Muslim community as a whole, even if one cannot reconcile with a specific person in that community (Rye et al., 2000).

3.2.4. Buddhism: The notion of forgiveness in Buddhism is comprised of two ideas (Rye et al., 2000). First, there is a ceasing of retribution. Second, there is a giving up of anger and resentment towards the wrongdoer. These are separate conditions but are highly desirable. Taken together, they are most accurately translated as forbearance. Forbearance indicates enduring a wrong done against oneself and giving up the anger and resentment connected to it—which is closely allied with, if not identical to, what forgiveness means. This means that no longer is an offender viewed as such. Instead, the victim empathizes with the offender’s suffering and even takes steps to ameliorate it, even though the offender deserves none of this (Rye et al., 2000). In this context this is when forgiveness is considered as being religious.

3.3. FORGIVENESS AS A POLITICAL PROJECT: THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONTEXT

Forgiveness as a political project has been described in the literature both locally and internationally. For example, Hayner (2000), states that there have been over twenty truth commissions in different parts of the world in the last twenty five years. Since 1973, more than 20 “truth commissions” had been established around the world, of which the majority (15) was created between 1974- 1994. Some of the commissions were created by international organizations like the United Nations (UN), a few by nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and the majority by the national governments of the countries. The
UN sponsored, financed, and staffed the truth commissions in El Salvador (1992–1993). Commissions sponsored by NGOs include Rwanda (1993) and Paraguay (1976). In South Africa, the African National Congress (ANC) sponsored the commissions of inquiry (1992 and 1993) investigating its own conduct during the anti-Apartheid struggle (Hayner, 2000). Examples of the commissions around the world include the Commission of Inquiry into Violations of Human Rights, established May 1986 in Uganda. The report was completed 1995 and created by Legal Notice No. 5 of 16 May 1986 by President Yowen Museveni. In Haiti, a National Commission for Truth and Justice was inaugurated, April 1995 and was completed February 1996. This commission was created by Executive order of December 1994 by President Jean Bertrand Aristide. Specifically in South Africa, the truth and reconciliation commission was inaugurated in 1995 and primary reports were completed. In 1998 the commission continued to operate several more years to complete amnesty hearings.

One of the most popular socio-politically inspired forgiveness projects that were implemented in recent history is the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) in South Africa. The TRC was established in terms of the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act No. 34 of 1995.

In order to give effect to this Act, the TRC was established with its specific mandate being to promote national unity and reconciliation in a spirit of understanding which transcends the conflicts and divisions of the past by:

a) Establishing as complete a picture as possible of the causes, nature and extent of the gross violations of human rights which were committed during the period from 1 March 1960 to the cut-off date, including the antecedents, circumstances, factors and context of such violations, as well as the perspectives of the victims and the motives
and perspectives of the persons responsible for the commission of the violations, by conducting investigations and holding hearings;

b) Facilitating the granting of amnesty to persons who make full disclosure of all the relevant facts relating to acts associated with a political objective and comply with the requirements of this Act;

c) Establishing and making known the fate or whereabouts of victims and by restoring the human and civil dignity of such victims by granting them an opportunity to relate their own accounts of the violations of which they are the victims, and by recommending reparation measures in respect of them;

d) Compiling a report providing as comprehensive an account as possible of the activities and findings of the Commission contemplated in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c), and which contains recommendations of measures to prevent the future violations of human rights.

Though the TRC process was essentially legal, the commissioners recognised the need to relate to this process a healing process that sought to assist survivors to cope with the emotional consequences of the trauma they experienced. In this regard, the perpetrator's request for forgiveness and the victim's capacity to forgive became the most important aspects of this process.

With the TRC having been concluded, there have been many questions regarding the usefulness of the process. One newspaper tells of how important it is for the South African psyche to be repaired given the fact that everybody in the country is believed to have been traumatised by the apartheid injustices:
A Truth and Reconciliation Commission was set up to deal with the political crimes and gross human rights violations of the apartheid era. But virtually nothing was done about repairing the psyche and soul of the South African person... A task for South Africa’s next government will be to begin the process of repairing our psyche. It must know that it will not be able to do it alone. An Urgent task for us all: Healing the psyche of a damaged people (2008, May 25). The Sunday Times, p.A.36.

In 1998, the South African Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation & the Khulumani Support Group conducted a study which surveyed several victims of human rights abuse during the apartheid era (Hamber, Nageng and O’ Malley 1998). The study revealed that most of the participants felt that the TRC failed to reconcile the black and white communities. Furthermore, the participants felt that justice was a prerequisite for reconciliation. There were also participants who were of the view that the TRC had favoured the perpetrators of the abuse more than the victims.

In another study, conducted by South Africa’s Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation & the Khulumani Support Group in 1998, the feelings of the survivors who took part in the TRC process were canvassed and presented. The study focused on the survivors’ feelings, thoughts and views before and after the TRC process. The feelings and opinions of these individuals regarding topics such as justice, punishment and amnesty were also explored. The sample included twenty survivors of political violence committed under the apartheid government. The article revealed that healing, truth, justice and reconciliation were interrelated. However, for the survivors, the relationships between the concepts were not linear, thereby suggesting that telling the truth or being told the truth did not automatically result in reconciliation. The article demonstrated that those who interacted with the TRC held a range of largely legitimate expectations. Most of the survivors were found to have expected, at the very least, to be told the truth about their case. Many are currently feeling let down by the TRC process, despite its successes at publicising the atrocities of the past and fostering national reconciliation. Given the large volume of deserving cases, it is
realistic to expect that not all the individual psychological and material needs of survivors could be discussed through the TRC.

Despite the shortcomings associated with the process, the TRC has been described as a catalyst that has provided an opportunity for most survivors to put the past behind them (Hamber, 1999). However, ongoing space still needs to be provided for survivors to express their feelings of sadness and rage as they struggle to come to terms with the psychological and emotional impact of their past loss and that much in their current structural situation remains unchanged. As Hamber (1999) states, survivors of apartheid violence should not be pushed down the road of forgiveness and amnesia if they are not ready, purely because it is nationally expedient.

3.4. THE PSYCHOLOGY OF FORGIVENESS

Some progress has been made in the identification of the variables that facilitate forgiveness. According to McCullough, Root, Tabak, and Witvleit, (n.d.) one way to organize these variables is to consider three basic psychological conditions that are theorized to play a role in motivating forgiveness: careworthiness, expected value, and safety. In the case of careworthiness, the transgressor is labelled “careworthy” when he/she is perceived by the victim as being an appropriate target for moral concern. A transgressor is viewed as having expected value when the victim anticipates that the relationship following the act of forgiveness will have future utility. The victim feels safe when a transgressor is perceived to be unable to harm them. Personality correlates might also have the ability to influence forgiveness because of its ability to influence perceived careworthiness, expected value and safety.
Some studies have found that forgiveness is positively associated with psychological well-being, physical health, and desirable relationship outcomes (Worthington & Scherer, 2004). For example, in two studies conducted by Brown (2003) and Thompson (2002), it was found that people who were likely to forgive others tend to score lower on measures of anxiety, depression and hostility. In another study by Kendler, Lui, Gardner, McCullough, Larson & Prescott (2003), people with a strong propensity to forgive (or a weak propensity to seek revenge when harmed by others) were found to experience a reduced risk for nicotine dependence disorders, substance abuse disorders, depressive disorders, and several anxiety disorders.

Witvliet (2001), states that the research done on forgiveness has encouraged therapists and counsellors to focus on forgiveness and health. Becoming more psychologically healthy is aided by the completion of the forgiveness process (Enright, 2001). According to Enright (2005), a Canadian psychiatrist found that after going through the process of forgiveness, clients that previously suffered from anxiety, depression, intense anger and paranoia symptoms, found that those symptoms had significantly decreased. Furthermore, in addition to bringing peace of mind to a person, forgiveness can also aid the enhancement of psychological health.

3.4.1. Forgiveness in a therapeutic context

Therapeutically, the “forgiveness triad” is described as forgiveness of others, self-forgiveness and seeking forgiveness for past wrongdoing. Symington (1994) tried to combine psychotherapy with religion because he was convinced that there was wisdom in the religious traditions which had been lost and that the idea of what constitutes mental health was not clear at all. He argues that “one of the problems is that psychoanalysis needs that sort of
philosophy to really bring human beings to fulfilment and that one of the problems with traditional religions is that although they have got the right philosophy tucked away inside somewhere, they also demonstrated that forgiving can occur without the help of therapeutic intervention. Von Krosigk (2000) and Enright & Fitzgibbons (2000) have proved that forgiveness can take place without the employment of therapeutic assistance but instead it is consciously willed from the descriptions of the subjective experiences of those individuals who forgave their injurers. North (1987), Von Krosigk (2000) and Enright and Fitzgibbons (2000) agree that forgiveness seems to be an internal change of heart, which ultimately results in the conscious will to forgive the injurer.

3.5. FORGIVENESS AND DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS

3.5.1. Age

Studies have been conducted on forgiveness and age, focusing on certain age groups. A study by Mullet and Girard (1997) found that a person’s age has something to do with how likely they are to forgive, with elderly people being more likely to forgive than young adults or teenagers. One study that has linked self efficacy to forgiveness was conducted by Luskin and Thoresen (1999). In this study, two groups of young adults were asked to respond to certain questions such as “I can think about the offence and remain calm and peaceful” and “I can take responsibility for the angry thoughts that arise toward the offender”. The participants were asked to rate the confidence they had on a scale from 1 to 100. The results were that those young adults who participated in a 10-week forgiveness education and intervention programme increased their overall confidence that they could forgive someone significantly more than a matched control group did.
Another study conducted by Girard & Mullet (1997), titled forgiveness in adolescents, young, middle-aged and older adults investigated the evolution of the propensity to forgive an offense by studying a sample of 236 people from various age groups. The effect of a number of circumstances connected with the offense was considered: intent to harm, severity of consequences, cancellation of consequences, social proximity to the offender, apologies from the offender and the attitude of others. The method was an application of information integration theory. A global increase in the propensity to forgive from adolescence to old age was observed. Several interactions between age and circumstances were found: (a) The effect of the cancellation factor was higher in young adolescents and in the very old than in the middle-aged, (b) the attitude of others and the restoration of harmony factors were important only in adolescents. Finally, the structure of the forgiveness schema was shown to be an addictive one, regardless of the age of the participants.

Enright, Knutson, Holter, Knutson & Twomey at the University of Wisconsin-Madison developed an approach namely, the forgiveness process model. The model encompassed four phases: Uncovering, Decision, Work, and Deepening (Enright, 2001; Enright & Human Development Study Group, 1996). In the Uncovering phase, the individual reflects on his/her psychological injury and also takes notice of his or her own subsequent anger, shame and possibly distorted thinking. In the Decision phase, the person tries to understand what forgiveness is and is not in a much deeper manner. Conscious commitment to forgive the offender is also made in this phase. In the Work phase, the person attempts to understand the perspective of the transgressor and may even develop compassion and empathy toward that person. In the Deepening phase, the person (one who forgives) reflects on his or her own past offenses. This is the acknowledgement of human vulnerability. This may facilitate finding new meaning in what happened and making deeper sense out of the experience. According to
Enright, Knutson, Holter, Knutson and Twomey (n.d.) (in APA, 2006), by finding positive meaning in events previously viewed as mostly negative, the forgiver releases resentment and may find a new life purpose. This allows for the possibility of healthy emotional regulation and a re-examination of self as more than just a victim.

This particular forgiveness therapy model has been used successfully with adults in a variety of settings in, improving the emotional health of the elderly (Hebl & Enright, 1993), college students psychologically hurt by emotionally-distant parents (Al-Mabuk, Enright & Cardis, 1995), survivors of incest (Freedman & Enright, 1996), men emotionally hurt by their partners abortion decision (Coyle and Enright (1997), adults in a residential drug rehabilitation unit (Lin, Mack, Enright, Krahn and Baskin, 2004) and emotionally-abused women (Reed & Enright, in press). All the studies have employed the “gold standard” of randomized experimental and control group designs with follow-up testing. Typical responses of forgiveness therapy are reductive in anxiety and depression and improvements in hope and self-esteem. Effect sizes tend to be strong (Baskin & Enright, 2004).

3.5.2. Religion

Since many of the worlds’ religions encourage forgiveness, it comes as no surprise that many individuals who are religious value the concept of forgiveness (Rye et al., 2000). When we look at our world currently, there are many ongoing wars happening under the name of religion. This is merely an indication of how many struggle with the concept of forgiving. Not only does unforgiveness contribute to war among individuals (Al-Mabuk, Enright, & Cardis, 1995; Bono, McCullough & Root, 2008; Coyle & Enright, 1997; Freedman & Enright 1996; Legaree, Turner & Lollis, 2007; Williamson & Gonzales, 2007), it also leads to poor psychological health regardless of religious affiliation.
Forgiveness can be considered to be an aspect of the religious life that heals relationships among people who live in close proximity 'forgive your brothers their misdeeds' (Genesis 50:17). When individuals have been hurt, our hearts and minds have been invaded and relationships have been damaged, forgiveness thus seems to be one aspect of human behaviour that needs to be done. According to Rosenak and Harnden (1992), religious individuals, particularly those of the Christian faith, have always experienced forgiving as a valued and desirable act and as the heart of the Christian message. Ransley and Spy (2004) state that one religion that has been associated with forgiveness is Christianity and that forgiveness in fact is one of the fundamental principles, however for numerous Christians the willingness to implement such action is wavering.

In a study titled Forgiving the Perpetrators of the September 11th Attacks: Associations with Coping, Distress, and Religiousness conducted by McIntosh, Kline, Wadsworth, Ahlkvist, Burwell, Gudmundsen, Raviv and Rea (n.d.) (in APA, 2006), at the University of Denver. Researchers investigated how being anti-forgiveness, ambivalent about forgiveness, or pro-forgiveness toward attackers related to involuntary engagement in thinking and feeling about the event, primary coping (attempts to directly alter emotional reactions or to problem-solve) or secondary control coping (e.g., changing how people think about events, positive thinking) and finding meaning in the event. Associations between forgiveness and psychological distress and between forgiveness and religiousness were examined. They predicted that firstly, forgiveness would be positively related to primary and secondary control coping. Secondly, that forgiveness would be incompatible with disengagement coping (e.g., avoidance). Finally, that forgiving would relate positively to finding meaning. A sample of 488 college students and 154 early adolescents were surveyed three to six weeks after the 9/11.
The results revealed that with regards to religion, in both samples the anti-forgiveness groups reported less religiousness than other groups; there was a similarity in the ambivalent and pro-forgiveness groups. This seems to suggest that religiousness may prevent people from rejecting forgiveness, even for the perpetrators of mass violence. However, religiousness may encourage individuals to value forgiveness without necessarily enabling them to forgive.

3.5.3. Education/ Educational Level

In Belfast, Northern Ireland, a most ambitious forgiveness programme to date was implemented by Enright, Knutson, Holter, Knutson, & Twomey (n.d.) (in APA, 2006). In this particular programme, which followed as a result of the development of a four-phase model to enhance forgiveness, the government implemented a curriculum in first grade classes in environments that were characterised by ongoing violence and poverty. As a result of the success that was achieved, the government decided to extend the programme to include second, third and fifth grades.

Forgiveness was introduced to children through story telling by trained teachers. Results across three studies to date (N = 327 children across all experimental and control groups in Belfast and Milwaukee) showed a statistically significant reduction in anger, favouring the children whose classrooms have been randomly assigned to the experimental group relative to the control group. Based on the reported success of the programme, there is an initiative currently to help teachers in over 100 classrooms worldwide to implement these programmes (Enright, Knutson, Holter, Knutson, & Twomey (n.d.) as cited in APA (2006)).
3.5.4. Gender, Age and Religion

Several socio demographic predictors such as gender, age and religion of forgiveness have been established through empirical research. In several previous studies, gender effect on forgiveness has been assessed. The usual finding is that gender plays a very limited role (McCullough et al., 2000). Moreover, its role tends to disappear when religious involvement is taken into account (Mullet, Barros, Frongia, Usai, Neto & Shafighi, 2003). Gender has, however, been shown to moderate some forgiveness-personality traits relationships (e.g., self-esteem, interdependence, and loneliness, Neto & Mullet, 2004). Age effect on forgiveness has also been assessed. For example, Girard and Mullet (1997) have shown that propensity to forgive increases as from adolescence to old age. Research has shown that religious involvement is positively correlated with self-reported tendency to forgive and negatively correlated with a tendency to seek revenge (Poloma & Gallup, 1991). More recently, Mullet et al. (2003) examined the interrelationship between religious involvement and forgiveness. A positive link was evidenced between religious involvement and two forgivingness factors: enduring resentment and overall tendency to forgive.

3.5.5. Forgiveness and relationships

It has been indicated that forgiveness plays an integral part in many counselling settings (Murray, 2002). Forgiveness has been used in therapy as a healing agent for resolving wounded relationships (Worthington & DiaBlasio, 1990) along with emotional wounds (Davenport, 1991). According to DiaBlasio (1993) forgiveness has played an important role in both personal and relational healing for many centuries. Relationships which at times need repairing due to some sort of transgression or betrayal are a significant part of human existence. Forgiveness can result in improved spiritual health (Worthington, 2005) and is
important in religious relationships among members of particular organizations or churches (Baskin & Enright, 2004).

A study titled, forgiveness and conflict resolution in marriage was conducted by Fincham, Beach and Davila (2004). Forgiveness usually occurs within a relational context and the nature of the relationship (e.g., closeness, quality) is related to forgiveness. Paradoxically, those we love are often the ones we are most likely to hurt. When interpersonal transgressions occur in such relationships they can elicit strong negative feelings and have the potential to disrupt the relationship. Spouses reported that the most important factors contributing to marital longevity and marital satisfaction is the capacity to seek and grant forgiveness. This research programme attempted to document how forgiveness impacts marriage and family based on the dual premises that (a) the family is the primary arena in which one learns to forgive and (b) forgiveness can be critical to sustaining healthy family relationships.

It was found that conflict resolution is integral to a successful relationship and resentment engendered by partner transgressions is likely to fuel couple conflict and impede successful conflict resolution. In contrast, forgiving the partner for the transgression is one potential means of providing closure with regard to a painful or disturbing relationship event. Forgiveness may therefore have substantial implications for long-term relationship outcomes as well as short-term patterns of interaction (Fincham, Beach and Davila, 2004).

Most research examined forgiveness in terms of decreased negative motivation, or unforgiveness (e.g., revenge, avoidance) toward the transgressor. Although decreasing unforgiveness is undeniably important, a benevolent motivational state toward the harm doer that is not achieved simply by overcoming negative motivation is fundamental to forgiveness.
Just as health is not the absence of illness, forgiveness is not the absence of unforgiveness. They tested this perspective in two studies that examined the impact of forgiveness on conflict resolution in marriage. Fifty-Two couples in Great Britain and 96 in the United States participated in the studies during a laboratory visit. It appears that wives’ forgiveness of husband transgression was particularly important for conflict resolution in marriage both in the short term and over time. In contrast, it is the husbands’ overcoming of unforgiveness that facilitated conflict resolution, at least in the short term. It is likely that these findings reflect gender differences in response to intimate partner conflict. Women are less likely to avoid and more likely to engage in problematic areas in need of discussion than are men. In this context, factors that increase husband withdrawal, such as unforgiveness, might be particularly likely to fuel a destructive demand-withdraw cycle, leading to increased reports by wives of ineffective arguing.

There is a difference in perspectives between the perpetrator and the victim of harm-doing (Kearns & Fincham, 2005) in that each encodes and recalls harm-doing events in self-serving ways (victims tend to overlook details that facilitate forgiving and embellish their memories with details that make forgiving more difficult; perpetrators embellish details that facilitate forgiving). In the usual course of events the victim spouse has to cancel a debt that is bigger than one acknowledged by the transgressor spouse. Thus, the transgressor spouse may see the partner’s reaction to the transgression as overblown and itself a wrongdoing. Should he or she act accordingly, the partner might feel doubly wronged and the couple could end up engaging in a chain of escalating, negative interaction.

The current data add to a growing body of knowledge that points to the ubiquity of forgiveness for sustaining successful intimate relationships. Hence the beginning to explore
unforgiveness as a public health problem (Fincham & Kashdan, 2004) and stress alternative vehicles (e.g., mass media) for the delivery of psycho-education to facilitate forgiveness in intimate relationships (Braithwaite & Fincham, 2006).

3.6. FORGIVENESS AND PERSONALITY

Researchers have begun to examine how personality relates to forgiveness (Mullet, Neto, & Riviere, 2005). Emmons (2000) argued that the relationship between personality and forgiveness can best be understood when personality is conceptualized as a multi-level construct including personality traits (level 1), strategies used to achieve, major life goals (level 2), and life narratives (level 3). Recently, the social- psychological factors in predicting forgiveness have been explored in the context of offence-related determinants, relational determinants, personality-level determinants and level of empathy. According to McCullough, Sandage, Brown, Rachal, Worthington and Hight (1998), factors such as a close relationship prior to the offence, combined with a high level of empathy for the offender, along with the offer of an apology, were strongly associated with the likelihood of forgiveness.

Furthermore this study revealed that one trait model that may be helpful in examining the relation between forgiveness and personality is the five-factor model of personality (Costa & McCrae, 1992). This model proposes that personality consists of five factors which summarize more detailed personality traits: neuroticism-emotional stability, extraversion-introversion, openness-closedness to experience, agreeableness-antagonism, and conscientiousness-undirectedness.
The five-factor model of personality has received some attention in previous studies of forgiveness. In a review of these studies, Mullet et al. (2005) showed correlations between enduring resentment and agreeableness ranged from -.10 to .43. The negative correlation was observed for altruism. The correlations between enduring resentment and neuroticism were most positive, ranging from .24 to .39. Depression presented the highest positive correlation with lasting resentment (.51), followed by anger, anxiety, and rumination. Extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness were only infrequently related to enduring resentment.

Mullet et al. (2005) also reviewed the correlations between personality dimensions and forgiveness of others. Correlations between forgiveness of others and agreeableness were all positive, ranging from .25 to .33, with the exception of Walker and Gorsuch’s study (2002). Correlations between forgiveness of others and neuroticism were negative, ranging from -.27 to .32 with the exception of Brown’s (2003) study. Anger presented the strongest negative correlation, followed by rumination and narcissism. Correlations between forgiveness of others and extraversion were mostly positive, although weaker than for agreeableness, and neuroticism, ranging from -.02 to .020. Correlations between forgiveness of others and conscientiousness were all positive and in the same range as those for extraversion (.04-.24). Correlations between forgiveness of others and openness were weak.

In a study conducted by Neto (2007) titled forgiveness, personality and gratitude, Block (1995) states that the Big Five model of personality, though pervasive, has come under criticism in recent years from personality theorists who suggest that the use of five global factors to describe personality loses valuable information available from the primary factors underlying the Big Five. Empirical studies have supported this claim, generally finding that the use of primary factors predicted greater variance than the Big Five alone, leading Saucier
and Ostendorf (1999: 623) to conclude that “measures of the Big Five alone under specify the domain of meaningful personality attributes”. Thus, this study had three purposes, to examine the following: the relationship between sociodemographic variables (sex, age, and religious involvement) and forgiveness, and in addition, determining whether personality domains add a significant amount of explained variance to our understanding of forgiveness beyond personality. The hypothesis, the same as in Mullet et al.’s study (2003) was that a link should be found between the religious involvement variables (belief in God and attendance in church) and two forgivingness factors: the overall tendency to forgive and enduring resentment. The religious involvement will predict positively the willingness to forgive and negatively the enduring resentment. First, due to the tendency for individuals high in neuroticism versus emotional stability to ruminate following an offence (McCullough et al., 2000) it was anticipated that individuals who score high on neuroticism versus emotional stability would have the highest enduring resentment, and the most difficulty with overall tendency to forgive. Second, because persons scoring high on agreeableness, by definition, are trusting and sympathetic, it was anticipated that there would be a negative association between agreeableness and enduring resentment and a positive association between agreeableness and overall tendency to forgive. It was hypothesized that gratitude would predict enduring resentment and overall tendency to forgive beyond these other variables.

The sample in this study consisted of one hundred and fifty-two college students ranging from the ages 18 to 26 years from the University of Porto who completed questionnaires. None of the participants were married. The questionnaires consisted of three questionnaires: the forgivingness scale, the NEO-FFI, and the gratitude questionnaire. All subjects were administered the Portuguese version of the NEO-FFI (Barros & Marques, 1996). Demographic information on age, gender, ethnicity, and educational level was required and
two additional questions were asked: “Do you believe in God?” and “Do you attend church every week (except when you are truly unable to do so)?”

The questionnaires were administered in groups ranging in size from 8 to 20 during a class session in a study of relationships with other people. No sex differences were observed among forgiveness and gratitude variables. As the forgiveness factors may measure different facets of forgiveness, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were analyzed among the three subscales to determine the amount of convergence. As expected, enduring resentment and overall propensity to forgive were significantly correlated, indicating that there is moderate overlap among the subscales. However, the other correlations were small, suggesting that the three subscales do not measure the same forgiveness factors.

Correlations between the five-factor personality domains and forgiveness measures were computed. Consistent with the hypotheses, neuroticism was positively correlated with enduring resentment, and positively correlated with overall tendency to forgive. Openness to experience was positively correlated with sensitivity to circumstances. None of the other five factor domains were significantly correlated with forgiveness measures. Neuroticism was not related to gratitude, while extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness to experience were positively related. Overall, the grateful tendency may be embedded with personality and showed distinctions beyond the Big Five. Three hierarchical regressions were performed to determine whether gratitude predicted the forgiveness measures beyond the demographic/background variables (gender, age, believe in God, and attendance in church) and the five personality factors. It was also found that participants who believe in God stated more willingness to forgive than participants who do not believe in God. Furthermore, participants who believe in God declared fewer enduring resentments than participants who
do not believe in God. Therefore, what made a difference in willingness to forgive and enduring resentment was the belief in God, not the attendance in church.

Results revealed that participants with a strong religious involvement showed no more sensitivity than others to the personal and social circumstances surrounding the offence. Other sociodemographic variables, such as gender and age were not important predictors of forgiveness. There is good evidence that people who are older tend to be generally more forgiving and less vengeful than are young people (e.g., Girard & Mullet, 1997; Mullet et al., 2003). However, the sample in this study was composed only of young people and within this age range a relationship between age and forgiveness was not expected.

Worthington’s (1998) assertion that neuroticism is an inhibitory characteristic of forgiveness has received empirical support (Ashton, Paunonen, Helmes & Jackson, 1998; Walker & Gorsuch, 2002). Not surprisingly, angry hostility, an important facet of Neuroticism, has been implicated as a consistent barrier to forgiveness (Kaplan, 1992; McCullough, Bellah, Kilpatrick & Johnson, 2001).

There are mixed findings regarding how the other five-factor domains relate to forgiveness of others. For example, Worthington’s (1998) suggestion that introversion is an inhibitory characteristic of forgiveness is supported by Ross, Kendall, Matters, Wrobel & Rye’s (2004) finding that forgiveness of others was positively related to Extraversion and the associated facets of warmth and positive emotions. Although Walker & Gorsuch (2002) found that individuals who were introverted were less likely to receive forgiveness from others, they found no relationship between forgiving others and the surgency or extraversion domain.
Several other predictors of forgiveness have been established through empirical research. For example, research has shown that people who are more religious tend to value forgiveness more than those who are less religious (Rokeach, 1973; Shoemaker & Bolt, 1977). Similarly, religious involvement is positively correlated with self-reported tendency to forgive and negatively correlated with a tendency to seek revenge (Poloma & Gallup, 1991).

This study found a positive relationship between forgiveness and extraversion. Although Ross et al. (2004) also found a positive relationship between forgiveness and extraversion; other researchers (Ashton et al., 1998; Walker & Gorsuch, 2002) have found no such relationship.

What is known from studies examining the relationship between forgiveness and personality is that higher levels of forgiveness are usually significantly associated with lower levels neuroticism (Ashton et al., 1998; Maltby, Macaskill & Day, 2001; Walker & Gorsuch, 2002).

A study conducted by Eysenck, Eysenck and Barrett (1985) titled a revised version of the psychoticism scale, revealed that the publication of psychoticism as a dimension of personality (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1976) and the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ; Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975) were accompanied by numerous criticisms of the psychometric properties of the P scale (Block, 1977a, b; Bishop, 1977), as well as other aspects of the concept itself; some of these were answered by Claridge & Birchall (1978), Eysenck (1977). Eysenck, Eysenck & Barrett (1985) tried to improve psychometric weaknesses in the P scale of the EPQ, by designing new items, based on the development of the original concept, testing the relevance of these items by new factor- analytic studies and construct improved questionnaires in the hope of improving upon the original version of the P scale.
Reports revealed three major faults in the original P scale, while not apparently interfering too much with its validity in group comparisons which made individual application rather hazardous. Firstly, the low reliability of the scale, 0.74 for males and 0.68 for females. (These are internal reliabilities; test-retest reliabilities are rather higher, viz. 0.83 and 0.71). Secondly, the low range of scoring, meaning that standard deviations were almost identical with means (3.09 and 2.36) indicated the third fault, namely the grossly skewed distribution of scores, which almost resembled a Poissonian distribution. According to Claridge (1981), the fact that in spite of these faults the scale was found to behave very consistently and predictably suggested that the validity was not depressed too much by these psychometric faults, but clearly if possible improvements should be made.

In fact two studies were carried out upon Claridge’s (1981) suggestion. The first used a 90-item questionnaire which contained the EPQ P scale plus possible new P items, together with 12 E and 13 N items selected from the EPQ. There were no L-scale items. The first sample was collected by random approach in the street and by house-to-house circulation of questionnaires. Furthermore, the sample tested consisted of 384 males and 290 females, whose ages ranged from 17 to 70 years, their respective age means being 40.01 ± 14.39 and 37.99 ± 14.47 years. The second sample was collected in a more orthodox manner, with groups of students, teachers and other willing and varied participants being approached to complete the questionnaire and return it by post. This sample used a 117-item questionnaire which contained all the 90 items of the EPQ plus almost all the possible new P items used for the questionnaire of the first study. There were 408 males and 494 females aged 38.44±17.67 and 31.80 ± 15.84 years, respectively, the range being the same as in the first study.
The items were intercorrelated separately for males and females and the resulting matrices factor-analysed by principal components in both the studies. In the first study, three factors were extracted and rotated through Varimax and then Promax, these being identified as P, E and N. In the second study, however, four factors were extracted and were similarly rotated using Direct Oblimin rotation. These were clearly identified as P, E, N and the L scale. Both sets of loadings were scrutinized for suitable P items to improve the original scale.

Rourke (in press) conducted a study titled Forgiveness-Seeking Motives and Behaviours. The results of this study comparing introverts and extraverts showed that forgiveness seeking depends on the severity of the act and on the perpetrator’s personality. It was also found that for both introverts and extraverts, when an offending act was severe, most perpetrators followed a similar sequence of forgiveness-seeking - they first reflected and sought to gain self-forgiveness before they asked forgiveness from others. It was however indicated that, in low and moderate guilt/severity situations, extraverts were more likely to immediately seek forgiveness from their victim (interpersonal forgiveness-seeking) while introverts were more likely to first turn inwards to try and soothe the self and forgive the self (intrapersonal forgiveness seeking) before seeking forgiveness from others. The study explored the reasons why both turn inward in high severity situations, and also, whether or not both types of forgiveness-seeking are required for resolution. The reason for this could be that once extraverted perpetrators receive forgiveness from their victims, they are able to move on from the situation and do not need to seek forgiveness from themselves.

Furthermore, Ortet, Ibanez, Moro, Silva and Boyle (1999) conducted a study on the psychometric appraisal of Eysenck’s revised Psychoticism scale: a cross-cultural study. The Spanish version of the Eysenck personality Questionnaire- revised (EPQ-R) was administered to a Spanish sample of 527 males and 583 females. Maximum-likelihood factor analyses of
the item intercorrelations and Direct Oblimin rotations of the extracted factors were carried out separately for males and females. The results revealed four factors identified as psychoticism (P), extraversion (E), Neuroticism (N) and dissimulation/conformity (L). Internal Consistency and test-retest reliability coefficients were satisfactory and very similar to the ones found in the original study. Skewness and Kurtosis of the P scale distribution were closer to normal than on the original British revised P scale.

3.7. FORGIVENESS AND WELL-BEING

Forgiveness has also been associated with better psychological well being, operationalized as high positive emotion, low negative emotion, high satisfaction with life, and low self-reported physical health symptoms (Bono, McCullough & Root, 2006). The first affective response is a general positive feeling which tends to be accompanied by friendly, loving, and relationship- constructive behaviour. The second is identified as hurt- perceived attack. This affective response is characterized by internal whining, innocent victimhood, fear, and worry. The third affective response is identified as righteous indignation, which is characterized by anger, contempt and thoughts of retaliation toward the partner.

A study by Affleck, Tennen, Croog, and Levine (1987) has suggested that when people were asked to imagine forgiving those that have wronged them or when they were asked to describe such transgressions, their cardiovascular reactivity tended to decrease (e.g., blood pressure and heart rate). On the other hand, in instances where those wronged were allowed to ruminate, or entertain grudge-related imagery, or to describe a transgression that they have not forgiven, the opposite occurs. Affleck et al. (1987) further reported that cardiac patients who blamed other people for their heart attack were more likely to have a recurrence.
Other studies have also suggested that forgiveness provides an alternative to maladaptive psychological responses such as rumination and suppression which appear to have negative consequences for mental and physical health. Forgiveness may substitute maladaptive behaviours such as smoking, alcohol and drug use as a way of coping with negative emotions and social experiences (Kendler, Lui, Gardner, McCullough, Larson & Prescott, 2003). Genuine forgiveness also facilitates beneficial emotion regulation processes, including the ability to process information that can promote compassion and the adoption of merciful thoughts, feelings, and behaviours that are associated with more positive and relaxed psychophysiological profiles (Witvliet et al., 2001).

Social support, which is a robust predictor of mental and physical health, is also influenced by forgiveness (House, Landis & Umberson, 1988). In as much as people who readily forgive their transgressors are better at maintaining positive relations with relationship partners (McCullough et al., 1998), they may be better at reaping the benefits of social support, experiencing relational closeness, commitment, willingness to accommodate, willingness to sacrifice and cooperation following a transgression. By contrast, failure to forgive close relationship partners can lead to “psychological tension” associated with the ambivalence that comes from a failure to extend benevolent behaviour to an important relationship partner. This psychological tension may potentially reduce life satisfaction and self-esteem. On the other hand, activating the concept of forgiveness made people more focused on other people, more likely to engage in volunteering and more likely to contribute to a charity-pro-relationship motivation that extends beyond the forgiver’s relationship with a specific offender (Karremans, Van Lange & Holland, 2005).
Interventions that emphasize forgiveness lead to an improvement in affect, decreased rate of occurrences of psychiatric illness, decreased physiological stress responses which ultimately improve one’s physical well-being and facilitates a greater sense of personal control and restoring of closeness in relationships.

Whilst forgiveness is generally associated with positive outcomes, this emotional experience seems to have its shortcomings as well. For example, the tendency to forgive has, in some cases, been blamed as a factor that leads to the perpetuation of intimate partner violence (Gordon, Burton & Porter, 2004). McCullough (2000) had earlier warned against the tendency to perceive forgiveness as an experience that is always positive. He argued that, in certain interpersonal situations, people with a willingness to forgive might put their health and well-being at risk.

3.8. RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

The following hypotheses are stated based on the literature reviewed and theoretical formulations studied:

1) That personality factors (P, E and N) will influence people’s willingness to forgive.
2) That demographic variables (such as age, gender, being religious, marital status and one’s level of education) of participants will influence their willingness to forgive.

3.9. SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

This chapter was aimed at reviewing relevant literature with regards to the current research. In particular, the chapter touched on the theological views on forgiveness; forgiveness as a political project and the psychology of forgiveness. Research that had been conducted on
forgiveness was also discussed. The last part of the chapter focused on the research hypotheses developed for the study based on the literature that was reviewed.
CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

4.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter focuses on the research methodology that was followed in this study. The chapter outlines the research design that was used, the sample size, the setting from where the participants were selected and the sampling procedure that was used. A brief explanation is also given of the methods and procedures that were followed in data collection and data analysis.

4.2. METHOD

4.2.1. Research design

The approach for the present study is quantitative in nature. In the present study, a cross-sectional design was used to carry out this study. Questionnaires were distributed that enabled the researcher to obtain information about the participants’ demographic details and their responses to a wide range of questions relating to forgiveness and personality. The questionnaire consisted of three Sections (A, B and C). Section A measured the demographic determinants of the respondents, Section B measured aspects of the respondents' personality such as psychoticism, extraversion and neuroticism. Section C measured the willingness to forgive of the respondent. There are 10 variables involved in this study, namely, demographic determinants (age, gender, religion, marital status, home language and educational status), personality (EPQ which consists of Psychoticism (P), Extraversion (E) and Neuroticism (N)) and Willingness to forgive.
The independent variables are the demographic determinants (age, gender, religion, marital status, home language and educational status), and personality (P, E and N). There is only one dependent variable and this is willingness to forgive.

Personality was measured by Eysenck's personality questionnaire (EPQ) and willingness to forgive was measured by the willingness to forgive scale developed by DeShea (2003).

4.2.2. Sampling

Convenience sampling was employed in this study. Two hundred and Fifty respondents of different age groups ranging from 18 to 68 years participated in the study. Mean age of participants was 28.4 with a SD of 12.3. There were no specific criteria used when choosing participants but the respondents had to be residents of Mafikeng. Residents must have lived in Mafikeng for more than 6 months. Only those who could read and write participated in the study. Only those who were 18 years or over participated in this study.

4.2.3. Research Setting

The focus area of the study was Mafikeng – a residential area in the North West Province. In 2001, Mafikeng had a population of 49,300. In 2007 it was reported to have a population of 250,000 of which the Central Business District (CBD) constitutes between 69,000 and 75,000. Mafikeng is the capital of North West Province and the prominent languages spoken are Setswana, English and Afrikaans (Mafikeng. Retrieved February 3, 2009, from the http://en.Wikipedia.org/wiki/ Mafikeng).

4.3. INSTRUMENTS

The Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) and Willingness to forgive scale were used as instruments for data collection in this study.
4.3.1. Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ)

The Eysenck Personality Questionnaire or EPQ was developed by Eysenck and Eysenck (1975) and it is a reliable research tool that is validated by criterion analysis. The questionnaire measures the three traits of extraversion/introversion (E), Psychoticism (P) and Neuroticism (N) described in the personality theory of Hans Eysenck.

The EPQ is a forced-choice 100-item instrument. The items on the EPQ are answered Yes or No according to the applicability (or otherwise) of each item to the respondent. The Lie Scale measures a tendency of some subjects to fake good or dissimulate.

The scale has been validated for prisoners in Nigeria in a study conducted by Idemudia (1997, 1998, 2000, and 2007). To determine the validity and reliability of the EPQ, all the items were factor analysed using principal component analysis with varimax rotation. All the items had high item loadings of at least 4; therefore, all the items were retained. Also, internal consistencies of the scales were high, Cronbach coefficient alpha for (P), 0.81; (E), 0.72; (N), 0.83 and (L) 0.76. Split-half reliability obtained was 0.80, 0.79, 0.81 and 0.30 for each of the scales P, E, N and L respectively. This indicates that the scales were highly reliable for use in the African setting. Awaritefe and Kadiri (1981) established concurrent validity for N on Nigerian subjects by correlating the scores on Spielberger, Gorsuch and Lushene’s (1979) State Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI) and the neuroticism scale. The neuroticism scale, N positively and significantly correlated with X-1 and X-2 (STAI X -1, \( r = 0.51, P < .01 \); STAI X-2, \( r = 0.920, P < .01 \)). N is a trait measure and so is X-2; N correlated more with X-2 than with X-1, a state measure. Furthermore, scores vary from one country to the next, even when the tests aren’t translations (e.g. North Americans are higher on E than Europeans; Australians are higher on P), as well as by sex and age. Research has also been done on
various demographic groups. For example, Chinese writers have scored higher on average on E, N, and P and lower on L (Hu and Gong, 1990). The EPQ has been widely used.

4.3.2. The Willingness to Forgive Scale

The Willingness to Forgive Scale presents scenarios describing a variety of transgressions and kinds of relationships that are presented to participants in an attempt to allow them to imagine themselves in multiple situations for possible forgiving of another person (De Shea, 2003). If individuals imagine themselves in the portrayed situations it is possible to decide whether he or she is willing to forgive or not, based on the feelings evoked.

Though the reliability and validity of the Willingness to Forgive Scale has not been widely reported, there are a few studies that have used this instrument. For example, Zandra D’Ambrosio (2005) conducted a study at Hofstra University in Long Island, New York that used the Willingness to Forgive Scale. The focus of the study was on the effects of transgressor attractiveness on forgiveness depending on both participant gender and transgressor gender. Unfortunately, the author did not give information regarding the reliability and validity of the instrument. However, a pilot result for this study showed a Cronbach coefficient alpha of .78 demonstrating that the scale is reliable and valid for use in this culture.

4.4. PROCEDURE

Permission to conduct the study was sought and obtained from the University of North West’s Research/Postgraduate Ethics Committee. The participants were approached and requested to participate. Respondents were sampled from Mmabatho and Mafikeng areas and the North West University campus. In some cases the researcher handed some questionnaires to lecturers to distribute to their students. These were lecturers that the researcher was
familiar with. It should be noted that this could also have been disadvantageous because it could have created a bias and some students may have felt that they are being coerced or compelled into participating. The researcher explained the purpose of the study to each participant and provided them with a participant consent form. A relaxed atmosphere was promoted by encouraging the participants to keep the questionnaires and to complete them at their leisure at home. Whilst there is an advantage in using convenience sampling, there is, however, a recognition that this method may not be completely representative of the entire population of the study or area on which the study is based.

Before the questionnaire could be administered, the researcher approached each participant to seek their permission to participate in the study. After the permission was given, the participant was given a consent form to read and sign (see Appendix A and B). The researcher ensured that the form was fully understood by each participant before it was signed. Copies of the questionnaire were then given to the participants who were asked to take their time to complete them. In some cases the completed copies were collected by the researcher approximately a few days after the participants had received them. Regarding confidentiality, each questionnaire was anonymous. This ensured that each participant's personal details are not indicated on the questionnaire.

4.5. STATISTICAL METHODS

The data was analysed quantitatively using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences [SPSS]. The data was described and analysed by employing descriptive statistics to summarise the essential features of the data. Frequency tables were employed in order to reveal the demographic characteristics of the participants in the study.
4.6. SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

This chapter discussed the research methodology that was used in this study. A cross-sectional design was employed, with a purposive sample of two hundred and fifty participants. Questionnaires were administered consisting of three sections that required demographic information, measured aspects of personality and the willingness to forgive of respondents.
CHAPTER 5
RESEARCH RESULTS

5.0. INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the findings of the study based on its aims, objectives and hypotheses as a result of using various statistical techniques.

The aim of the study was to explore, investigate and understand the personality and demographic factors (age, gender, religion, marital status and educational status) predicting willingness to forgive among Mafikeng residents.

The quantitative approach was employed for this study and was based on a survey design. Several variables were used in the study namely, personality (P, E, N), gender, age, religion, marital status, language, educational status and willingness to forgive. The only dependent variable was willingness to forgive. Personality (Psychoticism, Extraversion and Neuroticism) and the demographic factors (gender, age, religion, marital status, language and educational status) were all independent variables.

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used for analyzing the data collected. The technique of Multiple Regression was used in order to learn more about the relationship between several independent/predictor variables and a dependent/criterion variable.

5.1. RESULTS: DEMOGRAPHY

The respondents’ ages ranged from 18-68 years, the Mean was 28.4 (SD=12.3). With regard to the gender distribution, 88 of the respondents were male (40%) and 132 were female (60%).
One Hundred and sixty three (74.1%) of the respondents were Christian, 47 (21.4%) were Muslim, 3 (1.4%) were Hindu and 7 (3.2%) belonged to other religions.

In the Marital Status category, 55 (25.0%) of the respondents were married, 6 (2.7%) were divorced, 2 (.9%) were separated. 1 (.5%) was cohabiting, 3 (1.4%) were widowed and 150 (68.2%) were single.
With regard to languages spoken by respondents 71 (32.3%) were English speaking, 31 (14.1%) Afrikaans speaking and 93 (42.3%) were Setswana speaking. Twenty Four (10.9%) spoke other languages.
The educational levels were distributed as follows, 43 (19.5%) were Below Matric, 86 (39.1%) had Matric qualification and 86 (39.1%) were Post-Matric. The results of the frequencies are presented in graphs, figures 3 to 7.

**Figure 7. Graphical representation of educational status distribution of participants**

5.2. RESULTS: HYPOTHESES

Two hypotheses were stated for this study: 1 that personality factors (P, E and N) will influence peoples' willingness to forgive. 2: that demographic variables (such as age, gender, being religious, marital status and one’s level of education) of participants will influence their willingness to forgive.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression analysis was used to examine the relative contribution of personality and demographic variables. Personality variables were Psychoticism, Neuroticism and Extraversion. Demographic variables were gender, age, religion, marital status and education. The order of entry of the variables with the regression analysis is presented in Table 2. Outcome was willingness to forgive.
The demographic variables of religion, language and marital status, were created with dummy variables and used in the correlation analysis (Table I). Entry of the predictor variables was determined on the basis of their relative strength, as revealed by the Pearson Coefficients in Table I below.
Table 1
Correlations of Variables Willingness to forgive, Personality (PEN) and Demographic Variables (Religion, Educational Levels)

** <.01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>WtoFgive</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>Below Matric</th>
<th>Matric</th>
<th>Post Matric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>-.67**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>-.89**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>-.86**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Matric</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matric</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Matric</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* <.05
P = Psychoticism
E = Extraversion
N = Neuroticism

Personality variables of P, E and N were introduced at step 1 while demographic variables were entered at subsequent steps yielding two models (Table 2).

Table 2
Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Willingness to forgive (N = 214)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>25.436</td>
<td>2.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>23.564</td>
<td>2.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Matric</td>
<td>3.452</td>
<td>1.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change $R^2$</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F^2$</td>
<td>16.132**</td>
<td>11.460**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .001
Results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis using the stepwise method (as presented in Table 2) show that the overall model was significant, adjusted R square = .089, F (2,211) = 11.460, P < .001. Thus, Extraversion and Post Matric variables explained 8% of the total variance on willingness to forgive. Significant variables are shown below in Table 3.

Table 3: Predictor Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>P &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Matric</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>P &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For model 1, Extraversion was the only significant predictor of willingness to forgive. Neuroticism and Psychoticism did not and as such were excluded from the variables included in the stepwise method.

In model one, 6% explained the variance on willingness to forgive, and was significant, F (1,212) = 16.132, P < .001.

5.3. SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

This chapter summarised the demographic and hypothetical findings of this study. Tables and graphical representations were used to present statistical findings.
6.1. INTRODUCTION

This study investigated the personality and demographic factors predicting willingness to forgive among Mafikeng residents. Firstly, it was hypothesized that personality factors (Psychoticism, Extraversion and Neuroticism) will influence peoples’ willingness to forgive. Secondly, it was also hypothesized that demographic variables (such as age, gender, being religious, marital status and one’s level of education) of participants will influence their willingness to forgive.

The objective of this study was to understand the personality and demographic factors of willingness to forgive among Mafikeng residents, to understand how personality impacts on the willingness to forgive among Mafikeng residents and to understand if demographic determinants (age, gender, religion, marital status and educational status) play any role in the willingness to forgive among Mafikeng residents.

6.2. DISCUSSION

Forgiveness is a confusing concept and has been researched, although not very much with regards to investigating the psychological aspect of forgiveness. Religion has been said to be a major role player when it comes to forgiveness and whether to forgive or not.

According to the results of the study, post matric and extraversion were the only variables able to predict willingness to forgive. This study conforms with studies done by other researchers, such as Brown’s (2003) study in which correlation between forgiveness of others and extraversion was mostly positive. Thus, the more extraverted an individual is the more
likely they will be to forgive. With regards to education and post matric being a predictor of willingness to forgive, the higher/more educated an individual is, the more likely they are to forgive. This could mean that these individuals have greater knowledge of the concept of forgiveness and when to forgive.

The finding that extraversion (an aspect of personality) plays a role in forgiveness is consistent with emerging research suggesting that personality plays a role in forgiveness. In addition, Rourke’s (in press) study showed that forgiveness seeking depends on the severity of the act and on the perpetrator’s personality (comparing introverts and extraverts) and also showed that extraverts were more likely to immediately seek forgiveness and introverts first turned inwards. This could also mean that extraverts would be more likely to forgive their perpetrators. Overall, the findings of hypothesis one of this study is consistent with those of the mentioned studies.

Worthington’s (1998) suggestion that introversion is an inhibitory characteristic of forgiveness is not only supported by Ross et al.’s (2004) finding that forgiveness of others was positively related to Extraversion, but also by the findings in this study (Model 1, Table 2).

With regard to the Eysenck personality model that was adopted, this study is definitely in agreement with the statement that one’s ability to forgive is also influenced by your personality. The theory also states that it is more likely that an extroverted person would be more willing to forgive and this is what was also found in this study. However, introversion and other aspects of personality seemed to be poor predictors of willingness to forgive in this study. Thus, the fact that the theory states that under pressure, high neuroticism is a predictor
of a low tendency to forgive others, as well as many psychiatric disorders and lower psychological well-being (Hettema, Neale, Myers, Prescott, & Kendler, 2006). No significant findings were revealed on any other of the personality aspects that could predict willingness to forgive of residents in this study.

With regards to forgiveness and education, the results of this study (Hypothesis 1) seemed to be consistent with Enright, Knutson, Holter, Knutson and Twomey’s (n.d.) (in APA, 2006) implementation of forgiveness programmes based on their four-phase model to enhance forgiveness. It seemed to be successful and then the government later decided to extend the programme to include second, third and fifth grades. This could serve as proof that the more educated an individual is, the more likely they are to forgive because one’s understanding of the concept broadens.

The findings that demographic factors such as age and gender, were not important predictors of forgiveness is consistent with other studies conducted in which it was found that demographic factors were irrelevant in forgiveness.

Unlike studies conducted on age and forgiveness and the findings that a person’s age has something to do with how likely they are to forgive, this study revealed that age was not a predictor of willingness to forgive.

Inspite of the many studies that have found that religion was associated with forgiveness (e.g. Ransley & Spy, 2004), this study did not yield any findings with regard to these aspects. Therefore, the fact that religiousness may encourage individuals to value forgiveness without necessarily enabling them to forgive seems to be supported by this study. It does not mean
that because no significant results were found for religion as a predictor of willingness to forgive that participants do not value forgiveness, but have their own views of when to forgive or not.

McCullough et al. (2000) in their study found that gender played a very limited role in forgiveness. This study, however, revealed that gender played no role in forgiveness and people’s willingness to forgive.

Marital status and willingness to forgive yielded no significant finding. However, McCullough, Sandage, Brown, Rachal, Worthington and Hight (1998) found that factors such as a close relationship prior to the offence, combined with a high level of empathy for the offender, along with the offender of an apology, were strongly associated with the likelihood of forgiveness.

6.3. CONCLUSION
 Forgiveness is a topical subject that is beginning to attract the attention of the psychologist. In this study the following conclusions are made:

- That only post matric (educational level) and extraversion (EPQ) were predictors of willingness to forgive.
- The more highly educated or the higher one’s educational qualification is, the more likely the willingness to forgive of that individual.
- Gender played no role in the willingness to forgive among the residents of Mafikeng.
- This study did not yield any findings with regards to religion being a predictor of willingness to forgive. Thus, a person might be religious, as religiousness may
encourage an individual to value forgiveness but this does not necessarily facilitate a willingness to forgive.

- That age was not a predictor of willingness to forgive as in other studies.
- That various definitions and understandings of the meaning of forgiveness exist.

6.4. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The sample for this study was drawn from a relatively small town, Mafikeng (North West Province). Therefore, the results cannot be generalized to the larger South African population. The sample may only be interpreted as only representative of residents of that particular area.

The method of sampling used was convenience and snowball sampling as it was problematic to get participants.

The concept of forgiveness cannot be considered a stable and unchanging reality. For this reason, it is not realistic to expect the same results if the instruments were administered to the same sample on another occasion. It would be even more difficult to expect the same results if the instrument was administered to another sample in another town. One possible reason here is that people tend to have different interpretations of forgiveness and when to forgive. It is therefore important to consider that forgiveness cannot be considered a stable and unchanging reality.

This study relied on the self report method of data collection which may be subjected to intentional distortions by participants. The participants were expected to choose a response that they considered most appropriate at the time when they responded to the questionnaire.
There was no opportunity given to the participants to elaborate on their responses. This was due to the nature of the questionnaire. The questionnaire employed had already been standardized and had previously been used in studies. It consisted of close-ended questions which required close-ended answers.

Another shortcoming related to a self-report questionnaire of this nature is that there is no opportunity that is given to the participants to elaborate on their responses given the quantitative nature of the study.

Another limitation of this study is that the survey design was employed and a questionnaire was used for data collection. The sample size was 250 and only 220 copies of the questionnaire were returned. Thus, the disadvantage of using a questionnaire for data collection is a poor return rate.

6.5. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STUDY

Given the above limitations, the following recommendations are made for future studies:

a) Much larger samples should be used in future studies so as to make the findings more generalisable.

b) To perhaps employ a different type of sampling method and even a larger sample size.

c) In order to understand the various dimensions of forgiveness, it is recommended that both quantitative and qualitative approaches be used in future studies. Such approaches would probably ensure that different aspects relating to forgiveness are covered during the investigation.

d) To lessen the disadvantage of using a self-report questionnaire with close-ended questions to rather allow for open ended responses.
e) Given the disadvantage of using the survey design and questionnaire to employ other designs for future studies.

f) It is also recommended that other studies be conducted focusing on the other personality (Psychoticism and Neuroticism) and demographic factors (age, gender, marital status and language) that yielded insignificant results in this study and were unable to predict willingness to forgive. In order to investigate further the role that these factors play in willingness to forgive.

g) That a comparative study be conducted with this study. Thus, contributing further to the field of positive psychology research.

h) That even other personality scales (such as the big five factors) be employed and the study replicated to investigate if the same results would be yielded or not.
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CONSENT FORM TO BE SIGNED BY PARTICIPANT

CONSENT FORM

I ________________________________ (Please print full name & Surname), hereby agree to voluntarily give my consent to participate in a Masters Research project that focuses on the personality and demographic factors predicting willingness to forgive among Mafikeng residents.

I have received a satisfactory explanation of the general purpose of this study. Further, it is my understanding that my participation is voluntarily and that I will receive no form of remuneration for my participation.

I understand that I may terminate my participation in this survey at any point in time and if I should decide on that, that my decision will not have any negative consequences whatsoever. I also acknowledge that any data obtained will be held confidential and that the researcher has to report to her supervisor and that all data will be accessible to the supervisor as well. Lastly, I understand that this consent form will not be linked to the questionnaire.

Signature: ________________________________

Date: ________________________________
Date: 11 February 2010

Dear Participant

INFORMED CONSENT

Thank you for portraying interest in this study that focuses on the personality and demographic factors predicting willingness to forgive among Mafikeng residents. The purpose of the questionnaire is to explore the personality and demographic factors predicting willingness to forgive among Mafikeng residents.

Your responses will be treated with the highest degree of anonymity and will remain strictly confidential. The researcher will not attempt to identify you with your responses to the questionnaire or name you as a participant in the study. Please be advised that this survey is voluntary and that you are at liberty to terminate your participation in the study at any time.

The questionnaire comprizes three (3) sections- A, B and C. Section A requires demographic information, Section B looks at the personality, and Section C explores willingness to grant forgiveness.

Kindly answer all of the questions as truthfully as you can. Your participation in this study is valued. Thank you for taking the time to take part in this study and for responding to the questions to the best of your ability.

Yours Sincerely

Saajida Mahri
Masters Student

Prof. E.S. Idemudia
Supervisor
## QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE PERSONALITY AND DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS PREDICTING WILLINGNESS TO FORGIVE AMONG MAFIKENG RESIDENTS

**CODE:** ........................

### PART A: DEMOGRAPHIC DETAILS OF THE RESPONDENT

This section refers to some basic biographical information about yourself. Please mark with “X” next to the relevant options.

1. **Age of respondent** ........................................................................................................

2. **Gender of respondent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Religious affiliation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
<th>Hindu</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Marital status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Separated</th>
<th>Cohabiting</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Single</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Home language (Language spoken most often at home)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>Setswana</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Respondent's educational level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Below matric</th>
<th>Matric</th>
<th>Post- matric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART B: PERSONALITY SCALE

In this section, you are requested to respond to the questions with an X response that would apply to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you have many different hobbies?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you stop to think things over before doing anything?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does your mood often go up and down?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Have you ever taken the praise for something you knew someone else had really done?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Are you a talkative person?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Would being in debt worry you?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you ever feel 'just miserable' for no reason?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Were you ever greedy by helping yourself to more than your share of anything?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do you lock your apartment carefully for night-time?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Are you rather lively?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Would it upset you a lot to see a child or an animal suffer?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Do you often worry about things you should not have done or said?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. If you say you will do something, do you always keep your promise no matter how inconvenient it might be?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Would you enjoy skydiving?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Can you usually let yourself go and enjoy yourself at a lively party?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Are you an irritable person?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Have you ever blamed someone for doing something you knew was really your fault?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Do you enjoy meeting new people?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Is making insurance policies a good idea?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Are your feelings easily hurt?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Are all your habits good and desirable ones?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Do you tend to keep in the background on social occasions?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Would you take drugs which may have strange or dangerous effects?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Do you often feel ‘fed-up’?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Have you ever taken anything (even a pin or button) that belonged to someone else?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Do you like going out a lot?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Do you enjoy hurting people you love?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Are you often troubled about feelings of guilt?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Do you sometimes talk about things you know nothing about?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Do you prefer reading to meeting people?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Do you have enemies who want to harm you?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Would you call yourself a nervous person?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Do you always apologise, if you have been rude?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Do you have many friends?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Do you enjoy practical jokes that can sometimes really hurt people?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Are you a worrier?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. As a child did you do</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as you were told immediately and without grumbling?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Would you call yourself happy-go-lucky?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Do good manners and cleanliness matter much to you?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Do you worry about awful things that might happen?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Have you ever broken or lost something belonging to someone else?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Do you usually take the initiative in making new friends?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Do you easily understand how people feel, if they share their trouble with you?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Would you call yourself tense or 'highly-strung'?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Do you throw trashes on the floor if trash can is not available?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Are you mostly quiet when you are with other people?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Do you think marriage is old-fashioned and should be done away with?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Do you sometimes feel sorry for yourself?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Do you sometimes boast a little?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Can you easily get some life into a rather dull party?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Do people who drive carefully irritate you?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Do you worry about your health?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Have you ever said anything bad or nasty about anyone?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Do you like telling jokes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and funny stories to your friends?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Do most things taste the same to you?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Do you sometimes feel grumpy?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. As a child were you ever cheeky to your parents?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Do you like mixing with people?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Does it worry you if you know there are mistakes in your work?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Do you suffer from sleeplessness?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Do you always wash before a meal?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Do you nearly always have a 'ready answer' when people talk to you?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Do you like to arrive at appointments in plenty of time?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Have you often felt listless and tired for no reason?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Have you ever cheated at a game?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Do you like doing things in which you have to act quickly?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Is (or was) your mother a good woman?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Do you often feel life is very dull?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Have you ever taken advantage of someone?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Do you often take on more activities than you have time for?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Are there several people who keep trying to avoid you?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Do you worry a lot about your looks?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Are you always polite to even unpleasant people?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think people spend too much time safeguarding their future with savings and insurance?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever wished that you were dead?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you dodge paying taxes if you were sure you could never be found out?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you get a party going?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you try not to be rude to people?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you worry too long after an embarrassing experience?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever insisted on having your own way?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you often arrive at train just before its departure?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you suffer from 'nerves'?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever deliberately said something that hurts someone's feelings?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel awkward to be among people who tell harmless jokes about others?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do your friendly relations break up easily without your own will?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you often feel lonely?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you always preach what you preach?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you sometimes like to tease animals?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you easily hurt when people find fault with you or the work you do?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would life be too boring without risks</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever been late for an appointment or</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Do you like plenty of bustle and excitement around you?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Would you like other people to be afraid of you?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Are you sometimes bubbling over with energy and sometimes very sluggish?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Do you sometimes put off until tomorrow what you ought to do today?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Do other people think of you as being very lively?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Do people tell you a lot of lies?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Are you touchy about some things?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Are you always willing to admit it when you have made a mistake?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Would you feel very sorry for an animal caught in a trap?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART C: WILLINGNESS TO FORGIVE

In this section, you are requested to rate each of the scenarios that will be described below by marking with an X the response that would apply to you. If you are completely willing to forgive, you will mark an X next to item number 1. On the other hand, if you are not at all willing to forgive, you will mark an X next to item number 5.

1. You share an innovative idea with a co-worker, Chris, on how to improve efficiency and save money. During a staff meeting, you get surprised when your boss announces that Chris would be awarded R1 000-00 for an innovative idea that will improve work efficiency. Listening to the details, you realize that it is precisely the idea that you shared with Chris a few days ago.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely willing to forgive</th>
<th>Willing to forgive</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Not willing to forgive</th>
<th>Not at all willing to forgive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. You come home from work and find your roommate looking at your private diary. Your roommate claims to have been looking for a dictionary and that he/she had not really read much of your diary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely willing to forgive</th>
<th>Willing to forgive</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Not willing to forgive</th>
<th>Not at all willing to forgive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. A friend asks for a loan of R1 000-00 from you and promises to pay you back next month. You wait for six weeks without receiving the payment as promised. When you ask your friend to repay the debt he/she keeps on putting it off. Five months later, you still haven't collected the payment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely willing to forgive</th>
<th>Willing to forgive</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Not willing to forgive</th>
<th>Not at all willing to forgive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Your boyfriend/girlfriend, whom you have dated for two years, tells you that he/she wants to break up with you and admits that he/she has been involved with someone else whilst you were going out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely willing to forgive</th>
<th>Willing to forgive</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Not willing to forgive</th>
<th>Not at all willing to forgive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Your friend invites you to a party where you don’t know anyone else. You agree to meet at the hotel where the party is being held. When you arrive, your friend says hello to you but ignores you for the rest of the evening.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely willing to forgive</th>
<th>Willing to forgive</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Not willing to forgive</th>
<th>Not at all willing to forgive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. A co-worker asks you to run a work-related errand but you indicate that you are unable to assist since you are in the middle of another important assignment. After a few days, you learn from your boss that your co-worker had complained that you were uncooperative and difficult when you were asked to assist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely willing to forgive</th>
<th>Willing to forgive</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Not willing to forgive</th>
<th>Not at all willing to forgive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Whenever you see each other, your uncle teases you about your weight (saying you are too heavy or thin). You try to tell him that the teasing bothers you, but he does not seem to understand or care as he continues to tease you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely willing to forgive</th>
<th>Willing to forgive</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Not willing to forgive</th>
<th>Not at all willing to forgive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Your brother borrows your guitar and promises to give it back in a month’s time. When you approach him to get your guitar back, he tells you that he sold it because he did not think you wanted it anymore.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely willing to forgive</th>
<th>Willing to forgive</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Not willing to forgive</th>
<th>Not at all willing to forgive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. A friend stops calling you as he/she used to. You get concerned and bring this to his/her attention. Several weeks go by without your friend calling and when you try to call him/her your phone messages go unanswered. When you finally get hold of him/her and ask what is going on, he/she gets angry and yells at you to stop being so controlling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely willing to forgive</th>
<th>Willing to forgive</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Not willing to forgive</th>
<th>Not at all willing to forgive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Someone who has been a close friend for a number of years goes to live in another city. Later when you call, he/she tells you that he/she is too busy to talk to you and that you are part of his/her “old life”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely willing to forgive</th>
<th>Willing to forgive</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Not willing to forgive</th>
<th>Not at all willing to forgive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. You ask a friend to stay at your home while you are out of town for a week. When you come back home, the front door is unlocked and there is no one in the house. When confronted about it, your friend shrugs it off and tells you not
to worry since nothing was stolen from the house. The friend tells you that he accidentally left the door unlocked.

12. You buy some items at a convenience store. The cashier gives you the change and you walk outside. When you realize that you were short changed by R20-00, you walk back and ask the cashier to give you the rest of the change. The cashier denies making a mistake and refuses to give you back the money.
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