

The University of Hong Kong
Department of Psychology



Title of Thesis:

Does post apology behavior consistency contribute to organizational forgiveness and organizational trust of victim towards offender in workplace?

Student Name: Tsang Lung Chu Karina
University Number: 2001437171
Degree: PCPSYCH
Supervisor: Dr. Harry Hui
Year of Submission: 2007

Contents

Abstract	2
Introduction	3
Construct Definition	8
Method	14
Results	21
Discussion	23
Implications	26
Limitations	29
Conclusion	31
References	32
Appendix A (Consent Form, Questionnaire 1&2, Debriefing Form)	37
Appendix B (Original TRIM-12)	47
Appendix C (Original OTI- SF)	48
Appendix D (Translated and Modified TRIM-12 in Chinese)	49
Appendix E (Translated and Modified OTI- SF in Chinese)	50
Table 1	51

Abstract

This research studied the impacts of post-apology behavior consistency on forgiveness as well as trust in workplace. It was expected offender's consistent post-apology behavior following a workplace offense would elicit higher level of forgiveness and trust from victim while inconsistent post-apology behavior would lead to lower level of forgiveness and trust from victim towards offenders. Besides, this research further investigated whether workers from profit-making sectors and nonprofit sectors possessed higher or lower level of forgiveness and trust in response to post-apology behavior consistency. 96 participants were recruited. They were assigned into two experimental groups randomly. One experimental group was given consistent post-apology behavior while the other group was given inconsistent post-apology behavior. Pre-test and post-test were used to compare the differences in organizational forgiveness and trust levels before and after manipulation. Results supported the first hypothesis that the effect of post-apology behavior consistency on organizational forgiveness and trust was confirmed. The second hypothesis, however, was not supported. Neither organizational forgiveness nor trust showed significant difference between profit-making settings and nonprofit organizations in two experimental groups, which implied that the effectiveness of post-apology behavior consistency were widely spread across different business natures and settings.

Introduction

Forgiveness is a fairly new construct in psychology yet has become an important topic in the past 25 years (Farabaugh, 2006). It can be studied in many interpersonal relationships such as marriage and abusive family (Fincham, Hall, & Beach, 2006; Enright, Freedman, & Rique, 1998; Hargrave, 1994). Relationships are not limited to social life. What are the factors affecting the level of forgiveness after offenses? The relationship between apologies and forgiveness has been studied by many researchers. Ohbuchi, Kameda & Agarie (1989) suggested that apologies of wrong-doers could help relieve the offense feeling of harm to the victims. In Takaku's (2001) study, it was found that apologies could lead to victims' forgiveness of transgressor. Also, apologies were discovered that it might accelerate the cardiovascular recovery from anger among those who were tested having hostile personality predispositions (Anderson, Linden & Habra, 2006). However, there are times that the presence of apology after an offense cannot yield forgiveness from the victim in a relationship.

In those cases, does victim's disposition play a role? According to some research, forgivingness, one's tendency to forgive offenders which is stable over time and across situations, had an effect. It could potentially reduce one's emotional distress (Berry, Worthington Jr., Parrott III, O'Connor, & Wade, 2001). A highly agreeable extrovert will tend to be more likely to forgive after an offense (Berry, Worthington Jr., O'Connor, Parrott

III, & Wade, 2005). However, dispositional aspect is not the main interest in this research.

Contextual or situational aspects of forgiveness were also studied which this research will focused on. For example, the quality of relationship before an offense may be one of the determinants of forgiveness of victim's towards offender. Victims are more likely to forgive offenders when their relationships are highly satisfied, close to each other and highly committed (Fincham, Paleari, & Regalia, 2002; Finkel, Rusbult, Kumashiro, & Hannon, 2002; McCullough et al., 1998; Roloff & Janiszewski, 1989). Moreover, the perceived severity of the offense by victims may also have effects on victims' forgiveness. When there is more serious harm or damage perceived by victim, it is more difficult for victim to forgive offender, while it is easier for him to forgive if harm is less severe (Girard & Mullet, 1997; Ohbuchi, Kameda, & Agarie, 1989; McCullough et al, 1998).

Forgiveness in organizational settings has been an even newer hot topic being discussed in recent applied psychology and management research (Kelley & Waldron, 2006). It indicates an increase in forgiveness' importance in organizational level. It was suggested that forgiveness could be a facilitator of healthy relationships at times of offenses in organization (Aquino, Grover, Goldman, & Folger, 2003). Struthers, Dupuis and Eaton (2005) also proposed that forgiveness acts as promise to health and relationship promoter within workplace. Cameron, Bright and Caza (2004) proposed that forgiveness contributes to improve organizational harmony, increase productivity, save unnecessary expenses and

foster cooperation as well as collaboration among workers. In addition, some researchers suggested that organizational forgiveness can improve organization function and team relationships (Bolino, Turnley, & Booldgood, 2002).

Conflict in workplace, in most cases, is detrimental. However, conflict can be useful in stimulating creative ideas when forgiveness is being used as a problem-solving strategy. Forgiveness, in that case, can decrease victim's feeling of anger, resentment and negative judgment towards offender (Butler & Mullis, 2001; McCullough & Worthington, 1994).

Butler and Mullis (2001) conducted a research to examine the relationship between social interest and forgiveness in workplace. 153 master's-level business students participated in the study. Critical incident technique was used that participants were asked to visualize their most recent experience of an unfair hurt in workplace. Results showed that there was a strong relationship between social interest and forgiveness. Butler and Mullis thus proposed that organization development interventions focusing on social interest may promote forgiveness as a problem-solving strategy for workplace. Therefore, organizational forgiveness and its factors are worth studying. Besides social interest, other factors such as blame attributions, offender likableness, power and procedural justice climate relating to forgiveness in workplace have been studied (Bradfield & Aquino, 1999; Aquino, Bies & Tripp, 2006). In the present research, special attention has been drawn to one factor that is post-apology behavior consistency, which was studied by Felicia Lau (2004). Results

showed that an offender's post-apology behavior consistency would influence victim's decision to forgive, as well as victim's level of trust towards the offender. Thus, according to her study, post-apology behavior consistency could have effects on both the level of trust, in which trust was defined as "the willingness to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectations about another's behavior" (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer, 1998), and level of forgiveness.

Studies on consistent behavior and inconsistent behavior suggested that direct observations of consistent behavior were informative to impression judgments (Locksley, Hepburn, & Ortiz, 1982; Nisbett & Ross, 1980). Garlick (1993) conducted a research on prior descriptions and behavior consistency. Positive, negative or neutral information was presented to participants prior to viewing videos of either consistent or inconsistent behavior. He found that impressions would be significantly influenced by those prior descriptions when behavior was inconsistent but had only little impact when behavior was consistent. Consistent or inconsistent behaviors seem to have influence on people's perception towards that observed party. This behavior consistency effect can be extended to the present study. Would it be likely that post-apology behavior consistency influences victim's forgiveness and trust towards the offender in workplace? It may contribute to organizational settings if such impact can be proved. Therefore, this research will aim to replicate the same result as Lau found. In the current study, post-apology behavior

consistency will be examined through experiment. After apology from the offending coworker, the offender's consistent or inconsistent behavior may impose influence on victim's levels of forgiveness and trust towards the offender. Lau's experiment had two experimental groups in which one group was given consistent post-apology behavior and the other group was given inconsistent post-apology behavior. Same experiment will be used and same set of materials will be borrowed from Lau's research. Details will be discussed in later part of the study.

In addition to doing the same experiment, one additional variable is added in the study and that is the business nature of participants' workplace, whether it is profit or nonprofit sector. Rawls, Ullrich and Nelson Jr. carried out two studies to examine the differences between managers entering or reentering the profit and nonprofit sectors (1975). Results showed significant differences in a number of personality traits and value system dimensions between two groups of subjects. Rawls and his associates found that people choosing to work in nonprofit sector regard it as a vehicle for the implementation of social change. Participants rated themselves higher in warmth and closeness and they ranked forgiving as being more important than those in profit sector. Thus, they proposed that individuals choosing a nonprofit sector possess more positive attitudes. Therefore, it may be possible that people choosing to enter profit or nonprofit sector have different personality types, which may lead to a different result between profit and nonprofit

organizations.

In Lau's study, no attention was paid to different work settings which means there was no investigation was on specific organizational context. Aquino, Grover, Goldman and Folger (2003), nonetheless, criticized that the occurrence of forgiveness should be examined within a specific organizational or cultural context due to the reason that organizational norms and cultural expectations can act influences upon worker's decision to forgive. Workers in nonprofit organizations may have to confront with the norms and cultures when there is an offense. If organizational cultures and norms are varied in profit and nonprofit sectors, different results may be expected because of higher or lower of forgiveness level in either sector.

Studies also suggested that trust was associated with numerous positive organizational outcomes including long-term competitive advantage and tackling of poor economic advantage (MacMillan, Money, Money, & Downing, 2005; Silinpaa & Wheeler, 1998; Taylor, 1996) within non-profit organizations. Thereby, this research tries to further investigate if there is a significant difference on the effects of post-apology behavior consistency in profit-making business settings and non-profit making organizations on level of forgiveness and trust.

Construct definition

1.1 Post-apology behavior consistency

Post-apology behavior consistency refers to offender's either consistent or inconsistent behavior after his apology. Consistent post-apology behavior refers to the actions of offender attempting to restore the broken relationship with the victim after his apology. Inconsistent post-apology behavior refers to the failed actions of offender attempting to restore the broken relationship with the victim after his apology (Lau, 2004). The present study aims at examining the effect of post-apology behavior consistency in organizational setting. Garlick (1993) studied about the relationship between behavior consistency and impression formation. Results proposed that inconsistent behavior did influence impressions. Thus, it is expected that post-apology behavior consistency may also have the same impact on victim's likelihood to forgive offender.

1.2 Trust

Trust has been studied conceptually and empirically in wide range for three decays, ranging from interpersonal to organizational (Bradach & Wrightsman, 1989; Helgeson, 1994; Hosmer, 1995; Zand, 1972). For example, Golemiewski and McConkie (1975) argued that trust is strongly linked to confidence in desirable events which are taking place with overall optimism. Moreover, Zand (1972) emphasized that trust is the willingness of a person to increase his vulnerability to the actions of another in which his behavior is not under trusting person's control. Trust in organizations or even in the development of a management career is essential (Butler, 1991). Thus, organizational trust is worth studying.

Organizational trust in this study was operationalized as trustor's (i.e., victim's) belief among a group of coworkers that another coworker 1) makes good-faith efforts to behave in accordance with any explicit or implicit commitments; 2) is honest in any negotiations preceded such commitments; and 3) does not take excessive advantage of another even with the presence of opportunity availability. (Cummings & Bromiley, 1996). Cummings and Bromiley asserted that these three characteristics of trust are socially embedded and optimistic nature of most interactions within as well as between organizations. Thus, these three characteristics of trust are crucial in organizational trust. When trust is serving in organizations, transactions costs are reduced. In that case, both individuals and organizations are benefited from organizational trust. Cummings and Bromiley's Organizational Trust Inventory – Short Form (OTI-SF) was used in order to assess victim's organizational trust level.

1.3 Forgiveness

The definitions of forgiveness are under debate among researches. Enright and Coyle (1998) defined forgiveness as the willingness to abandon victim's right to resentment, condemnation and revenge towards offender who acts unjustly. Moreover, Aquino, Bies and Tripp (2006) referred forgiveness as the internal act of relinquishing anger, resentment and the desire to seek revenge against the offender. McCullough, Pargament and Thoresen (2000) concluded a core feature of definitions of forgiveness from various

researchers: when victims forgive an offender, the responses toward him/her would become more positive and less negative. It means that victims show less desire to take revenge and less desire to avoid personal contact with offenders when forgiving takes place.

McCullough et al. proposed that forgiveness is an intraindividual and prosocial change, which is situated within a specific interpersonal context, toward an offender. Such definition is being adopted in the present study.

McCullough et al. (1998) suggested that forgiveness can help restore cooperation between relationship coworkers after an offense. This function is corresponding to one of the functions of trust construct as discussed above. Hargrave & Sells (1997) defined forgiveness as allowing victims to rebuild trust in the relationship through acting in a trustworthy fashion. Furthermore, Rusbult, Kumashiro, Finkel and Wildschut (2002) proposed that there is a positive association between trust and forgiveness. Thus, trust is closely related to forgiveness. In order to explore organizational forgiveness, it is also beneficial to study organizational trust.

Transgression-related interpersonal motivations (TRIM) inventory invented by McCullough et al. (1998) is used to measure organizational forgiveness level.

1.4 Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

Research investigating behavior consistency suggest that there are linkages between

behavior consistency and forgiveness as well as trust. Rusbult et al. (2002) suggested that the aftermath behavior of offender after transgression increases or decreases victim's probability of forgiveness according to offender's consistency. When there is consistent behavior, the chance that victim's forgiving offender will be higher. In addition, some researchers proposed that a continual, predictable and consistent behavior encourages trust development between two parties (Holmes & Rempel, 1989). Moreover, other researchers suggested that behavior consistency is one of the factors to promote trust among working team members (Larson and LaFasto, 1989). Therefore, it is reasonable to predict that there will be similar influences of post-apology behavior consistency on victim's trust and forgiveness towards offenders in organizational level.

The first hypothesis is that after offender has apologized, his post-apology behavior consistency may influence victim's level of trust and forgiveness towards the offending coworker in the workplace. It is expected that a consistent post-apology behavior leads to higher trust and forgiveness levels while an inconsistent post-apology behavior leads to lower trust and forgiveness levels.

Hypothesis 2

As discussed above, one's personality traits, organizational norms and cultures may influence his choice to work in profit-making business settings or in nonprofit sector (Aquino, Grover, Goldman, & Folger, 2003; MacMillan, Money, Money, & Downing, 2005;

Rawls, Ullrich, & Nelson Jr., 1975; Silinpaa & Wheeler, 1998; Taylor, 1996). The second hypothesis is that it is expected that workers of nonprofit sectors have higher level of organizational trust and forgiveness than those of profit-making business settings in response to both post-apology consistent and inconsistent behavior after offense.

People choosing to work in nonprofit sector possess higher warmth and closeness and they regard forgiveness as more important than those who work in profit-making settings. With higher predisposition to impose social change, it is predicted that victims, who chooses to enter nonprofit sector, is more likely to forgive and trust offenders than those victims who choose to enter profit-making sector.

Besides, victim may be imposed pressure to forgive offenders in order to follow the organizational norms and cultures, which can be explained by the concept of cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957). After the offense, victim in nonprofit sector may not forgive offender at first. However, due to the discrepancy between the two thoughts that he should forgive the offender imposed by the nonprofit organizational norm and his own thought about avoidance of the offender, the victim may alter his cognitive thoughts so as to reduce the tension caused by the two contradicting cognitions. With the same rationale, after a consistent post-apology behavior following the offense, higher levels of trust and forgiveness of victims who work in nonprofit sector toward offender than those victims who work in profit-making organizations are expected. Furthermore, higher levels of trust

and forgiveness of victims who work in nonprofit sector toward offender are expected, even if there is an inconsistent post-apology behavior following the offense.

Method

Participants

Participation in the study was voluntary. Participants ($N=96$) were recruited through friends or relatives and through their personal network in the study. Participants were all full-time employees, with 50 and 46 of them working in profit-making business settings and nonprofit organizations such as public schools, charitable organizations, Christian organizations (excluding government sectors) respectively. It was a convenient sample that 30 participants were personally known to me and the remaining were personally known to friends and relatives. Nonetheless, biased results were minimized since random assignment was used during the distribution of questionnaires, which will be discussed below.

According to self-reported demographics, the age of respondents ranged from 20 to 40 or above years and the mean age of respondents was 30.3 years ($SD = 7.7$). Among all participants, 35.5 percent were male and 62.5 percent were female. Of all respondents, 66.7 percent had no religion, 15.6 percent were Christians, 9.4 percent were Catholics, 6.3 percent were Buddhists and 2.1 percent had another religion besides the above mentioned religions.

Materials

In order to enhance the understanding of reading for participants, only Chinese version of questionnaires was prepared. Materials used in the research included a consent form, either questionnaire 1 or questionnaire 2 and a debriefing form. Respondents first acknowledged their right as research participants from consent forms, and then they started doing the questionnaire. Finally a debriefing form was given in the end.

There were two sets of questionnaires. Questionnaire Set 1 contained a control scenario and experimental scenario 1. It was prepared for experimental group 1. Questionnaire Set 2 also contained a control scenario, which was exactly identical to that of Questionnaire Set 1, and experimental scenario 2. Questionnaire Set 2 was prepared for experimental group 2. Besides the difference in experimental scenarios, the other parts comprised of trust measurement (OTI-SF), forgiveness measurement (TRIM) and personal demographical data which were the same in both sets of questionnaires.

(See Appendix A for details)

Manipulations

In each set of questionnaire, there were two main parts comprised of a control scenario and an experimental scenario. All the scenarios were borrowed from Lau (2004). The scenarios were real life examples in workplace. The control scenario consisted of an offending scenario as well as an apology scenario, so as to hold offence severity, offender

responsibilities and apology constant. Participant was asked to imagine that he was Coworker A. In the control scenario, two coworkers were preparing a presentation for an important project. On the day of presentation, however, Coworker B arrived late at the meeting and he had not well-prepared the presentation. Finally, he even raised the bidding price on his own will without the knowing and consensus of Coworker A. Coworker B, nevertheless, apologized to participants and promised that he would do no more mistakes, raise bidding price with Coworker A's notice and be responsible for writing up the bidding failure report. After reading the control scenario, participants filled out the two measurements of trust and forgiveness. This was regarded as the pre-test before manipulation.

Post-apology behavior consistency was used as independent variable in the present study. The independent variable was manipulated by presentation of one of two experimental scenarios. In experimental scenario 1, a consistent post-apology behavior was described while an inconsistent post-apology behavior was described in experimental scenario 2. The experimental scenario represented either a consistent or an inconsistent post-apology behavior after the offense in control scenario. Again, participant was asked to imagine himself as Coworker A. In experimental scenario 1, Coworker A read the bidding failure report prepared by Coworker B while he was still in meeting. Coworker B actually admitted his own fault. Other than that, he fully prepared for the presentation when there

was another proposal presentation cooperated with participant later on. In experimental scenario 2, Coworker A read about the bidding failure report as well. Yet, Coworker B wrote that it was the participant who insisted to raise the bidding price. Moreover, Coworker B arrived late on the presentation day again; he changed the design of promotion venue and raised the total cost by 25 percent all without participant's notice. His explanation on that was time limitation. After reading the experimental scenario, participants filled out the two measurements of trust and forgiveness again. This is regarded as the post-test after manipulation.

The control scenario was able to serve its purpose according to Lau (2004). A two-tailed independent group t-test showed that there was no significant differences between the average score of level of trust in experimental group 1 and experimental group 2 ($t(221) = -.43, p > .05$). In addition, no significant differences were found between the average score of level of forgiveness in two experimental groups ($t(221) = -.09, p > .05$). Due to the control of possible confounding variables, any difference in trust and forgiveness levels between two experimental groups could be explained by the manipulation.

According to Lau's study (2004), the two experimental scenarios, consistent and inconsistent post-apology behaviors, were successful to elicit differences in average score between control scenario and experimental scenarios. Several statistical tests were run in Lau's research and results showed succeed of the scenarios in performing their purposes. In

experimental group 1, the average score of trust level ($t(51) = -17.37, p < .05$) as well as forgiveness level ($t(50) = -12.96, p < .05$) showed significant differences between the pre-test (control scenario) and post-test (experimental scenario 1). It indicated that respondents highly regarded offender's behavior as consistent in experimental scenario 1. Likewise, in experimental group 2, the average score of trust level ($t(51) = 18.58, p < .05$) as well as forgiveness level ($t(50) = 19.59, p < .05$) showed significant differences between the pre-test (control scenario) and post-test (experimental scenario 2). It indicated that respondents highly regarded offender's behavior as inconsistent in experimental scenario 2.

Furthermore, significant differences were found between the average scores of trust ($t(100) = 22.30, p < .05$) and forgiveness ($t(100) = 22.63, p < .05$) in two experimental groups (Lau, 2004).

As a result, all scenarios were able to serve their purposes. Thus, the control and two experimental scenarios were borrowed to the present study.

Procedure

30 sets of questionnaires were distributed by me in person. They were friends, relatives and ex-coworkers. On the other hand, 10 voluntary administrators, who were personal friends, were recruited. Each administrator was given a briefing on the purpose and logistics of the study as well as two packages of questionnaires. They solicited responses through their personal network including friends and coworkers. In all case,

participants were asked to read and sign a consent agreement explaining the study and assuring anonymity. Administrators assigned Questionnaire Set 1 and Questionnaire Set 2 to participants at random. For those participants who were assigned Questionnaire Set 1 were in experimental group 1 while those who were assigned Questionnaire Set 2 were in experimental group 2. Participants then read the control scenario in either questionnaire set and were asked to complete the questionnaire assessing trust and forgiveness level. Upon the completion of control scenario part, they moved on to read the experimental scenario part, which was placed in the turnover page to prevent respondents reading it before reading the control scenario. Then, they filled out the second assessments of their trust and forgiveness level in response to post-apology behavior consistency after the offense. Consent forms and questionnaires were returned to administrators once participants finished, and then were returned for data analysis. Debriefing forms regarding the purpose of the research were distributed and kept by respondents.

Measures

Organizational Forgiveness. The Transgression-Related Interpersonal Motivations Scales- 12 Items Form (TRIM-12) was used to measure the level of organizational forgiveness at pre-test and post-test of manipulation (McCullough et al., 1998).

McCullough et al. reported that the TRIM-12 had high internal consistency reliability ($\alpha = .86$). Respondents rated 12 items on a 6-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1= strongly

disagree to 6= strongly agree. The original scale was a 5-point Likert-type scale but was revised to 6-point rating scale due to minimize the central tendency of responses. Also, the 12 items were originally negatively framed so as to indicate victim's motivation to take revenge as well as to avoid the offender. In present study, 2 items were positively framed so as to indicate the absence of avoidance and revenge motivations. The reason was to minimize a response set from participants (Lau, 2004).

High score in TRIM-12 scale indicated the presence of avoiding offender and seeking revenge motives towards offender, while low score in TRIM-12 indicated the absence of avoidance and revenge motivations towards offender. In other words, the lower the score, the higher the organizational forgiveness level of victim towards offender.

(See Appendix B for original TRIM- 12)

Organizational Trust. The Organizational Trust Inventory – Short Form (OTI– SF) was used to measure the organizational trust level in the present study. OTI- SF is measuring three dimensions as discussed above: one's belief on coworker's 1) ability to keep commitments; 2) honesty in negotiations; and 3) avoidance to take excessive advantage. Bentler's comparative reliability fit index was .98 and these three dimensions were highly correlated. Moreover, the composite reliability of dimensions was reported high (Cummings & Bromiley, 1996). Thus, OTI- SF was chosen to measure organizational trust by Lau (2004). Respondents rated 15 items on a 6-point Likert-type

scale ranging from 1= strongly disagree to 6= strongly agree. The original scale was a 7-point Likert-type scale but was revised to 6-point rating scale due to minimize the central tendency of responses (Lau, 2004).

(See Appendix C for original OTI- SF)

Both TRIM- 12 and OTI- SF were translated to Chinese version in Lau's study (2004) for better understanding of item descriptions and consistency with scenarios. Internal consistency of the Chinese versions of TRIM- 12 (12 items, $\alpha = .86$) and OTI- SF (15 items, $\alpha = .84$) was high.

(See Appendix D & E for the translated Chinese version of TRIM-12 and OTI- SF)

Results

This study of trust and forgiveness were both a 2 (experimental group) x2 (pre-/post-test) factorial design. To test the major hypotheses, two separate two-way mixed repeated measure ANOVA were performed. The mean scores of pre-test and post-test of two experimental groups are given in Table 1. In experimental group 1, the mean scores of level of trust in pre-test and post-test were $M = 3.43$ ($SD = .54$) and $M = 4.41$ ($SD = .59$) respectively; while the means scores of level of forgiveness in pre-test and post-test were $M = 3.13$ ($SD = .64$) and $M = 2.49$ ($SD = .73$) respectively. It is important to notice that lower level of score indicated lower level of avoidance and revenge motives. In experimental group 2, the mean scores of level of trust in pre-test and post-test were $M = 3.19$ ($SD = .54$)

and $M = 2.00$ ($SD = .61$) respectively; while the means scores of level of forgiveness in pre-test and post-test were $M = 3.16$ ($SD = .73$) and $M = 4.13$ ($SD = .79$) respectively.

For the construct of trust, analysis established a significant main effect of two experimental groups [$F(1, 94) = 202.49, p < .05$]. The two experimental groups (consistent and inconsistent post-apology behaviors) were significantly different from each other in terms of average score in the measurement of trust. On the other hand, the main effect of time measurement (i.e. pre-test and post-test) was not significant [Wilk's Lambda = .17, $F(1, 94) = 1.92, p > .05$], which meant that the mean score of level of trust in control scenario was not significantly different from that of in experimental scenarios. However, an interaction was found between experimental groups and time measurement in trust level [Wilk's Lambda = .00, $F(1, 94) = 238.18, p < .05$]. Effects of experimental groups were unequally distributed in two tests at different time. An independent t-test was run. The results of t-test were that: experimental groups and mean score of trust level in pre-test was $t(94) = 2.25, p < .05$ with .03 significance level; experimental groups and mean score of trust level in post-test was $t(94) = 19.71, p < .05$ with .00 significance level. Thus, experimental groups had more impacts on the post-test than on the pre-test.

For the construct of forgiveness, analysis established a significant main effect of two experimental groups [$F(1, 91) = 40.40, p < .05$]. The two experimental groups (consistent and inconsistent post-apology behaviors) were significantly different from each other in

terms of average score in the measurement of forgiveness. Furthermore, the main effect of time measurement (i.e. pre-test and post-test) was also significant [Wilk's Lambda = .02, $F(1, 91) = 91.00, p < .05$], which meant that the mean score of level of trust in control scenario was significantly different from that of in experimental scenarios. In addition, there was an interaction found between experimental groups and time measurement in forgiveness level [Wilk's Lambda = .00, $F(1, 91) = 144.59, p < .05$]. Effects of experimental groups were unequally distributed in pre-test and post-test of forgiveness levels. An independent t-test was run. The results of t-test were that: experimental groups and mean score of forgiveness level in pre-test was $t(91) = -.24, p = .82$ (i.e. $p > .05$); experimental groups and mean score of forgiveness level in post-test was $t(94) = -10.53, p = .00$ (i.e. $p < .05$). Thus, experimental groups had different impacts on two tests.

Results of the nature of company (i.e. profit-making and nonprofit making) and experimental groups in level of trust as well as in level of forgiveness were [Wilk's Lambda = .70, $F(1, 92) = .15, p > .05$] and [Wilk's Lambda = .34, $F(1, 89) = .93, p > .05$] respectively. Thus, no significance results of the main effect, in which the nature of company would influence the level of trust and forgiveness level in response to post-apology behavior consistency, were found.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the impacts of offender's post-apology

behavior consistency on victim's level of trust and forgiveness towards the offender in organizational level. Findings were consistent with hypothesis 1. Results revealed that offender's post-apology behavior consistency can influence both victim's level of trust and forgiveness towards him. The relationship, again, between post-apology behavior consistency and forgiveness has not been fully explored by many researchers. However, according to the present study as well as Lau's study (2004), results perhaps can give an insight that post-apology behavior consistency may be one new domain in organizational forgiveness.

The significant differences of average scores in level of trust and forgiveness in two experimental groups indicated an importance of offender's post-apology behavior consistency. An offense followed by apology alone is not enough to restore the broken relationship, yet offender's consistent post-apology behavior closely followed the offense is crucial. The reason may be that the continual putting effort in offender's consistent behavior strengthens victim's trust on him and that he feels more positive rather than negative after the consistent post-apology behavior, therefore, forgiveness level is raised. On the other hand, offender's inconsistent post-apology behavior fails to pay effort to reconcile so the broken relationship cannot be restored. Results were consistent with Lau's study (2004).

Interaction effects in both trust and forgiveness levels were found. Results indicated

that inconsistency in offender's post-apology behavior following offense produces larger effects on both trust and forgiveness level. Findings showed a significant difference in organizational trust between two experimental groups (one reading consistent post-apology behavior; one reading inconsistent post-apology behavior) even in the pretest before manipulation. Thus, it indicates that trust level between these two groups were already great before the presentation of inconsistent post-apology behavior. After manipulation, the difference in their organizational trust level towards offender was even significantly larger. This result suggests that post-apology behavior consistency has a great impact on organizational trust among employees. Such finding was consistent with Schweitzer, Hershey and Bradlow's research (2006). They suggested that trust harmed by deception never fully recovers. Inconsistent post-apology behavior may be regarded as deception by victim due to offender's failed actions to compensate and make up for the broken relationship with victims. Meanwhile, results revealed a significant difference in organizational forgiveness level in two experimental groups after the manipulation of inconsistent post-apology behavior, it, again, suggests the importance of post-apology behavior consistency in organizational forgiveness.

Findings in this study failed to support hypothesis 2. Results indicated that business nature (profit-making or nonprofit sectors) does not impose influence on the effects of post-apology behavior consistency on organizational trust and organizational forgiveness.

Neither trust nor forgiveness level showed significant difference between profit-making settings and nonprofit sectors in two experimental groups. In other words, victim's who work in nonprofit sector does not show higher level of trust and forgiveness towards offender than those who work in profit-making business settings in response to post-apology behavior consistency following the offense. It is proposed that the effectiveness of post-apology behavior consistency are widely spread across different business natures and settings. Even though people who choose to work in nonprofit sector are more positive and have different needs (i.e. to impose social change), and may be under the influence, or pressure of organizational norms, victims do not show higher trust or forgiveness level towards offender. On the other hand, people who work in profit-making business settings do not show lower level of trust and forgiveness towards offender. Results indicated that post-apology behavior consistency is equally important when considered by people working in different business settings with different personality and organizational cultures.

Implications

Results from this study have several implications for managerial levels in organizations. Organizational forgiveness may be one of the new and possible strategies to resolve a broken relationship between workers after an offense. Experiences of workplace offense, in which either we inflict or those inflicted on us, are common and always happen

to individuals since most people spend about one-third of waking hours in a working environment (Worthington, Berry, Shivy, & Browstein, 2005). Tepper (2000) argued that voluntary turnover of workers is better predicted by violations of interactional justice than by distributive or procedural justice and it implies that interpersonal relationship is of vital importance. Interpersonal conflicts in workplace threaten the quality of workplace relationships, yet organizational forgiveness can facilitate the repair of relationships between offenders and victims (Metts, Cupach, & Lippert, 2006). According to them, Mett and his associates argued that forgiveness is uniquely situated between offenses and restoration of working relationships, so forgiveness is the central key. Besides, forgiveness brings along other benefits: It helps the working teams and organization be more affectively positive in higher frequency and such environment can foster more productivity when employees are more forgiving. In addition, turnover may also be lessened (Worthington, Berry, Shivy, & Browstein, 2005). Thus, promoting forgiveness in organization settings will benefit the whole working world. Bradfield and Aquino (1999) suggested that one way to encourage forgiveness is to raise employee's awareness of the potential benefits of forgiveness through training and development interventions.

Further implication is that researcher and training parties in organizations can develop effective training and intervention programs for employees in both a theoretical and practical way. Struthers, Dupuis and Eaton (2005) suggested that social motivation training,

which aims to restructure one's attributions, is effective to promote forgiveness among coworkers. In addition, the current study revealed that apology alone was not sufficient to elicit forgiveness from victim toward offender. Therefore, organizations can raise employees' awareness of one's behavior consistency when dealing with workplace conflicts (Lau, 2004).

Furthermore, organizational trust is undoubtedly important among different levels or within same levels of coworkers because working together requires some degree of trust in day-to-day contact (McKnight, Cummings, & Chervany, 1998). Post-apology behavior consistency influences the trust restoration, which is closely linked to forgiveness (Rusbult, Kumashiro, Finkel, & Wildschut, 2002). Thus, intervention programs addressing organizational forgiveness together with organizational trust are worth studying. Future research should be focus on such relationship between these two constructs.

Limitations

Several limitations in the study deserve comments. The first limitation is that it is a cross-sectional nature of design. Data collections of pre-test and post-test were collected at one point in time, the lasting effect cannot be studied. Longitudinal research or testing at different times will help investigate this problem.

Another limitation is that some important mediating variables may not have been identified such as anger. Bies, Tripp and Kramer (1997) argued that anger mediates the

process leading from personal offense to forgiveness. Thus, anger may mediate the relationship between post-apology behavior consistency and trust or forgiveness.

An additional limitation of the present study is lacking of actual involvement in the situation. This may lessen the effects that may be found in real witnessed or real experienced situation (Stone & Kotch, 1989). More realism can be added by possibly using video tapes or virtual-reality technology, so that a more accurate causal relationship can be observed (Pierce & Aguinis, 1997).

The fourth limitation is that dispositional aspect of trust and forgiveness in participants was not controlled in present study. As previous research showed that personality trait of forgivingness predisposes people to have a tendency to forgive offenders and is stable over time and across situations (Roberts, 2005). Significant difference between two experimental groups in the control scenario (pre-test before intervention) about organizational trust level was found, which was the problem of not controlling dispositional aspect. Larger participant pool is suggested for future research. Division of participants according to different predisposition of trust and forgiveness levels such as possessing of high/ low forgivingness and so forth can eliminate such problem (Lau, 2004).

One final suggestion for future research is that researchers can particularly focus on between managerial and subordinates level or inter-organizational level by grouping

participants into managerial and non-managerial groups, so that comparisons between different levels may be possible. Would post-apology behavior consistency be less effective between manager-subordinates level when compared to within subordinate level? Would it be more effective between inter-organizations? These comparisons are worth investigating.

Conclusion

Forgiveness has been studied more widely as a strategy for coping with conflicts in organizations. Substantial evidence in literature and research suggested that forgiveness not only heal people, relationships but also workplace conflicts (Aquino, Grover, Goldman, & Folger, 2003; Butler & Mullis, 2001; Cameron, Bright & Caza, 2004; Dupuis & Eaton, 2005;; McCullough & Worthington, 1994; Metts, Cupach, & Lippert, 2006; Worthington, Berry, Shivy, & Browstein, 2005). Results from the present study suggested that post-apology consistent behavior after offense can facilitate organizational forgiveness and organizational trust level from victim towards offender. As a result, other than apology, post-apology behavior consistency is crucial in restoration of relationship. Management and training teams should develop intervention and training programs for employees in order to minimize the shortcomings of offenses but manifest the benefits of forgiveness. Finally, it should be reminded that forgiveness can be applied in all relationships across parent-child, friends, coworkers, inter-organizations and societal levels.

References

- Anderson, J., Linden, W., & Habra, M. (2006). Influence of apologies and trait hostility on recovery from anger. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 29*, 347-358.
- Aquino, K., Grover, S., Goldman, B., & Folger, R. (2003). When push doesn't come to shove: Interpersonal forgiveness in workplace relationships. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 12*, 209-216.
- Aquino, K., Bies, R. J., & Tripp, T. M. (2006). Getting even or moving on? Power, procedural justice, and types of offense as predictors of revenge, forgiveness, reconciliation, and avoidance in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 653-668.
- Berry, J., Worthington Jr., E., Parrott III, L., O'Connor, L., & Wade, N. (2001). Dispositional forgivingness: development and construct validity of the transgression narrative test of forgiveness (TNTF). *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*, 1277-1290.
- Berry, J., Worthington Jr., E., O'Connor, L., Parrott, L III., & Wade, N. (2005). Forgiveness, vengeful rumination, and affective traits. *Journal of Personality, 73*, 183-225.
- Bies, R. J., Tripp, T. M., & Kramer, R. M. (1997). At the breaking point: Cognitive and social dynamics of revenge in organizations. In R. Giacalone & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Antisocial behavior in organizations* (pp.18-36). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., & Booldgood, J. M. (2002). Citizenship behavior and the creation of social capital in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 27, 505-522.
- Bradach, J. L., & Eccles, R. G. (1989). Price , authority, and trust: From ideal types to plural forms. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 15, 97-118.
- Bradfield, M., & Aquino, K. (1999). The effects of blame attributions and offender likableness on forgiveness and revenge in the workplace. *Journal of Management*, 25, 607-631.
- Butler, D., & Mullis, F. (2001). Forgiveness: A conflict resolution strategy in the workplace. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, 57, 259-272.
- Cameron, K. S., Bright, D., & Caza, A. (2004). Exploring the relationships between organizational virtuousness and performance. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 47, 766-790.
- Cumming, L. L., & Bormiley, P. (1996). The Organizational Trust Inventory (OTI): Development and validation. In R. M. Kramer & T. R. Tyler (Eds), *Trust in organizations: Frontier of theory and research* (pp. 16-38). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Enright, R. S., & Coyle, C. T. (1998). Researching the process model of forgiveness within psychological interventions. In E. L. Worthington (Ed.), *Dimensions of forgiveness*

(pp.139-161). Radnor, PA: Templeton Foundation Press.

Enright, R., Freedman, S., & Rique, J. (1998). The psychology of interpersonal forgiveness.

In R. D. Enright & J. North (Eds.), *Exploring Forgiveness*, (pp. 46-62). Madison:

University of Wisconsin Press.

Farabaugh, M. (2006). An inquiry into the role of forgiveness in Benedictine community

life. *Dissertation abstracts international: section B: The Sciences and Engineering*,

67, 2831.

Fincham, F. D., Paleari, G., & Regalia, C. (2002). Forgiveness in marriage: The role of

relationship quality, attributions and empathy. *Personal Relationships*, 9, 27-37.

Fincham, F. D., Hall, J., & Beach, S. (2006). Forgiveness in marriage: current status and

future directions. *Family relations: Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family*

Studies, 55, 415-427.

Finkel, E. J., Rusbult, C. E., Kumashiro, M., & Hannon, P. A. (2002). Dealing with betrayal

in close relationships: Does commitment promote forgiveness? *Journal of Personality*

and Social Psychology, 82, 956-974.

Garlick, R. (1993). Prior descriptions and behavior consistency. *Communication Research*

Reports, 10, 59-68.

Golemieski, R. T., & McConkie, M. (1975). The centrality of interpersonal trust in group

processes. In C. L. Cooper (Ed.), *Theories of group processes* (pp.131-185). New

York, NY: Wiley.

Hargrave, T. D. (1994). Families and forgiveness: a theoretical and therapeutic framework.

The Family Journal, 2, 339-348.

Hargrave, T. D., & Selles, J. N. (1997). The development of a forgiveness scale. *Journal of*

Marital and Family Therapy, 23, 41-62.

Hosmer, L. T. (1995). Trust: The connecting link between organizational theory and philosophical ethics. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 379-403.

Kelley, D., & Waldron, V. (2006). Forgiveness: communicative implications for social relationships. In C. S. Beck (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 30*, (pp303-341).

Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

McCullough, M. E., & Worthington, E. L. (1994). Encouraging clients to forgive people who have hurt them: Review, critique, and research prospectus. *Journal of*

Psychology and Theology, 22, 3-20.

McCullough, M. E., Sandage, S. J., Brown, S. W., Rachal, K. C., Worthington, E. L., &

Hight T. L. (1998). Interpersonal forgiving in close relationships: II. Theoretical elaboration and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75,

1586-1603.

McKnight, D. H., Cummings, L. L., & Chervany, N. L. (1998). Initial trust formation in new organizational relationships. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 473-490.

Metts, S., Cupach, W. R., & Lippert, L. (2006). Forgiveness in the workplace. In J. M. H.

Fritz & B. L. Omdahl (Eds.), *Problematic Relationships in the workplace*

(pp.249-278). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.

Ohbuchi, K., Kameda, M., & Agarie, N. (1989). Apology as aggression control: its role in

mediating appraisal of and response to harm. *Journal of Personality and Social*

Psychology, 56, 219–227.

Pierce, C. A., & Aguinis, H. (1997). Using virtual reality technology in organizational

behavior research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 407-410.

Roberts, R. C. (2005). Forgivingness. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 32, 289-306.

Roloff, M. E., & Janiszewski, C. A. (1989). Overcoming obstacles to interpersonal

compliance: A principle of message construction. *Human Communication Research*,

16, 33-61.

Rawls, J. R., Ullrich, R. A., & Nelson, Jr., O. T. (1975). A comparison of managers entering

or reentering the profit and nonprofit sectors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 18,

616-623.

Rousseau, M., Sitkin, S., Burt, R., & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: a

cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 393-404.

Schweitzer, M. E., Hershey, J. C., & Bradlow, E. T. (2006). Promises and lies: Restoring

violated trust. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 101, 1-19.

Stone, D. L., & Kotch, D. A. (1989). Individuals' attitudes toward organizational drug testing policies and practices. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 518-521.

Struthers, C. W., Dupuis, R., & Eaton J. (2005). Promoting forgiveness among co-workers following a workplace transgression: The effects of social motivation training. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 37*, 299-308.

Takaku, S. (2001). The effects of apology and perspective taking on interpersonal forgiveness: a dissonance-attribution model of interpersonal forgiveness. *Journal of Social Psychology, 141*, 494-508.

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*, 178-190.

Worthington, E. L., Berry, J. W., Shivy, V. A., & Browstein, E. (2005). Forgiveness and positive psychology in business ethics and corporate social responsibility. In R. A. Giacalone, C. L. Jurkiewicz, & C. Dunn (Eds.), *Positive psychology in business ethics and corporate responsibility* (pp.265-284). Greenwich, CN: Information Age Publishing.

Zand, D. E. (1972). Trust and managerial problem solving. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 17*, 229-239.

Appendix A

Consent Form

研究資料提供同意書

本人為香港大學心理學系心理學後學士文憑課程之學生，現正進行一項有關人際關係的畢業論文研究。因此，現在誠意邀請閣下參與是項研究。你只需提供簡單的個人資料，以及完成此份問卷，便可為此項研究提供寶貴的資料作分析用途。閣下有權於研究進行中任何時候中止參與，完成整份問卷大約需時二十分鐘。

本問卷分三部份，請按照次序填寫，直至全問卷完成為止。

閣下提供的所有資料只供學術用途，代號會用以代替姓名，而問卷內容只有負責本研究的人員才能存取，故閣下的資料將絕對保密。請注意本研究並沒有風險，卻也不會對閣下有直接的受惠或報酬，但閣下的參與將使社會組織的人際關係的研究跨進一大步。

若有任何疑問或者諮詢，歡迎直接與本人 Karina Tsang 聯絡（電話：60765868；電郵地址：karina@hkusua.hku.hk）。如果閣下對作為參與者的權利有任何疑問或者諮詢，請聯絡香港大學的 Human Research Ethics Committee（電話：22415267）。

非常感謝你對是次人際關係研究的支持和參與。

本人 _____ (姓名) 同意參與此項人際關係研究並提供真實資料，而我明白所提供的資料只供學術用途，將絕對保密。

簽署

日期

[預備日期：17/ 4/ 2007]

Questionnaire Set 1
Control Scenario (Pre-test)
問卷內容

第一部份 假設你是事件中的受害者，細閱以下事件後，請回答有關問題。

假設你的上司要你和同事甲合作，為某大企業的一項大型招標項目擬寫計劃書，且到該公司發表。你和同事甲已經合作過幾次，算是合作無間，上司都很放心把工作交給你們。

在計畫書發表當日，同事甲因晚上玩得太累而睡過時，他不但遲到，也沒有為發表作好準備。在你不知情的情況下，他更把你們一早協議好的投標價由三十萬港幣增加到四十萬港幣。最後因為你們的表現不佳和投標價略高，你們的計畫書沒有被接納。那可觀的佣金因此而泡湯，亦因為這樣而被上司責罵。

事後同事甲向你道歉，並解釋增加投標價的原因，是因為希望你們能多分一點佣金。同事甲答應下次再和你合作的時候，不會有任何閃失，也不會私自把投標價提高。為表歉意，同事甲答應你他會負起擬寫投標失敗的報告書的責任，負責向上司交代。他更邀請你到你最喜歡的餐廳共進晚餐。你們過了一個愉快的晚上。

問題一 你認為以下的句子，在什麼程度上是同事甲的寫照？請按照下列指標圈出你的答案。

	極為不是	頗為不是	略為不是	略為是	頗為是	極為是
1 同事甲堅持遵守諾言。	1	2	3	4	5	6
2 同事甲想與我和解。	1	2	3	4	5	6
3 同事甲在商議中說真話。	1	2	3	4	5	6
4 同事甲專佔那些毫無防範和脆弱的人的便宜。	1	2	3	4	5	6
5 同事甲是可靠的。	1	2	3	4	5	6
6 同事甲誠實地與我商議。	1	2	3	4	5	6
7 同事甲總是佔著優勢，並支配別人。	1	2	3	4	5	6
8 同事甲言行一致。	1	2	3	4	5	6
9 同事甲公平地與我商議雙方的期望。	1	2	3	4	5	6
10 同事甲靠踩低別人而建立自己的成功。	1	2	3	4	5	6
11 同事甲盡了和我議訂的責任。	1	2	3	4	5	6
12 同事甲想與我重修舊好。	1	2	3	4	5	6
13 同事甲想佔我的便宜。	1	2	3	4	5	6
14 同事甲嘗試逃避他對別人的承諾。	1	2	3	4	5	6
15 同事甲不會誤導我。	1	2	3	4	5	6

問題二 你有多大可能會對同事甲作出以下的事情？請按照下列指標圈出你的答案。

	極為不會	頗為不會	略為不會	略為會	頗為會	極為會
1 我會令同事甲付出代價。	1	2	3	4	5	6
2 我會疏遠同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6
3 我希望不幸的事會發生在同事甲身上。	1	2	3	4	5	6
4 我會忽視同事甲，使他不存在我的生活中。	1	2	3	4	5	6
5 我不會再信任同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6
6 我希望同事甲得到應得的報應。	1	2	3	4	5	6
7 我會友善地對待同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6
8 我會逃避同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6
9 我會向同事甲取回我應該得到的。	1	2	3	4	5	6
10 我會與同事甲斷絕關係。	1	2	3	4	5	6
11 我不希望見到同事甲受傷害和苦難。	1	2	3	4	5	6
12 我會離開同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6

Department of Psychology

Experimental Scenario 1 - Post-apology Consistent Behavior (Post-test)

第二部份承接著第一部份發生的事件，請繼續閱讀以下接著發生的事，然後回答問題。

幾天後，你去找同事甲吃飯，但他還在開會，你便在他的座位等他。你看到他枱上的投標失敗的報告書，便拿來一看。你看到報告上列出投標失敗的原因，是因為同事甲的遲到，沒有準備好及私自把投標價增加到四十萬港幣。

幾個月後，上司要你和同事甲再度合作，為公司一年一度的大型推廣計劃擬寫計劃書。這一次同事甲很小心地處理這個計劃，並與你商討每項推廣的細節。你們認真地商議，且協定了推廣的費用在二十萬港幣之內。在發表計劃書的前一晚，同事甲更約定你在公司做一次發表預習。發表計劃書的早上，同事甲很早便返到公司，為發表作好準備。

問題一 請回想在幾個月前，你在第一部份發表計劃書失敗的原因，並參考同事甲在幾天後及幾個月後的行為，你認為以下的句子，在什麼程度上是同事甲的寫照？請按照下列指標圈出你的答案。

	極為不是	頗為不是	略為不是	略為是	頗為是	極為是
1 同事甲在商議中說真話。	1	2	3	4	5	6
2 同事甲是可靠的。	1	2	3	4	5	6
3 同事甲不會誤導我。	1	2	3	4	5	6
4 同事甲靠踩低別人而建立自己的成功。	1	2	3	4	5	6
5 同事甲想與我和解。	1	2	3	4	5	6
6 同事甲嘗試逃避他對別人的承諾。	1	2	3	4	5	6
7 同事甲總是佔著優勢，並支配別人。	1	2	3	4	5	6
8 同事甲想與我重修舊好。	1	2	3	4	5	6
9 同事甲堅持遵守諾言。	1	2	3	4	5	6
10 同事甲專佔那些毫無防範和脆弱的人的便宜。	1	2	3	4	5	6
11 同事甲盡了和我議訂的責任。	1	2	3	4	5	6
12 同事甲言行一致。	1	2	3	4	5	6
13 同事甲想佔我的便宜。	1	2	3	4	5	6
14 同事甲誠實地與我商議。	1	2	3	4	5	6
15 同事甲公平地與我商議雙方的期望。	1	2	3	4	5	6

問題二 請回想在幾個月前，你在第一部份發表計劃書失敗的原因，並參考同事甲在幾天後及幾個月後的行為，你現在認為你有多大可能會對同事甲作出以下的事情？請按照下列指標圈出你的答案。

	極為不會	頗為不會	略為不會	略為會	頗為會	極為會
1 我會逃避同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6
2 我會向同事甲取回我應得的。	1	2	3	4	5	6
3 我會友善地對待同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6
4 我會令同事甲付出代價。	1	2	3	4	5	6
5 我會離開同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6
6 我希望同事甲得到應得的報應。	1	2	3	4	5	6
7 我不希望見到同事甲受傷害和苦難。	1	2	3	4	5	6
8 我會疏遠同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6
9 我會忽視同事甲，使他不存在我的生活中。	1	2	3	4	5	6
10 我會與同事甲斷絕關係。	1	2	3	4	5	6
11 我希望不幸的事會發生在同事甲身上。	1	2	3	4	5	6
12 我不會再信任同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6

第三部份 個人資料

性別： 男性 女性

宗教： 沒有 基督教 天主教 佛教 其他

年齡： 19 歲以下 20 - 29 歲 30 - 39 歲 40 歲或以上

公司業務性質： 商業 非商業

全問卷完。謝謝你對是次人際關係研究的參與和支持。

Questionnaire Set 2
Control Scenario (Pre-test)
問卷內容

第一部份 假設你是事件中的受害者，細閱以下事件後，請回答有關問題。

假設你的上司要你和同事甲合作，為某大企業的一項大型招標項目擬寫計劃書，且到該公司發表。你和同事甲已經合作過幾次，算是合作無間，上司都很放心把工作交給你們。

在計畫書發表當日，同事甲因晚上玩得太累而睡過時，他不但遲到，也沒有為發表作好準備。在你不知情的情況下，他更把你們一早協議好的投標價由三十萬港幣增加到四十萬港幣。最後因為你們的表現不佳和投標價略高，你們的計畫書沒有被接納。那可觀的佣金因此而泡湯，亦因為這樣而被上司責罵。

事後同事甲向你道歉，並解釋增加投標價的原因，是因為希望你們能多分一點佣金。同事甲答應下次再和你合作的時候，不會有任何閃失，也不會私自把投標價提高。為表歉意，同事甲答應你他會負起擬寫投標失敗的報告書的責任，負責向上司交代。他更邀請你到你最喜歡的餐廳共進晚餐。你們過了一個愉快的晚上。

問題一 你認為以下的句子，在什麼程度上是同事甲的寫照？請按照下列指標圈出你的答案。

	極為不是	頗為不是	略為不是	略為是	頗為是	極為是
1 同事甲堅持遵守諾言。	1	2	3	4	5	6
2 同事甲想與我和解。	1	2	3	4	5	6
3 同事甲在商議中說真話。	1	2	3	4	5	6
4 同事甲專佔那些毫無防範和脆弱的人的便宜。	1	2	3	4	5	6
5 同事甲是可靠的。	1	2	3	4	5	6
6 同事甲誠實地與我商議。	1	2	3	4	5	6
7 同事甲總是佔著優勢，並支配別人。	1	2	3	4	5	6
8 同事甲言行一致。	1	2	3	4	5	6
9 同事甲公平地與我商議雙方的期望。	1	2	3	4	5	6
10 同事甲靠踩低別人而建立自己的成功。	1	2	3	4	5	6
11 同事甲盡了和我議訂的責任。	1	2	3	4	5	6
12 同事甲想與我重修舊好。	1	2	3	4	5	6
13 同事甲想佔我的便宜。	1	2	3	4	5	6
14 同事甲嘗試逃避他對別人的承諾。	1	2	3	4	5	6
15 同事甲不會誤導我。	1	2	3	4	5	6

問題二 你有多大可能會對同事甲作出以下的事情？請按照下列指標圈出你的答案。

	極為不會	頗為不會	略為不會	略為會	頗為會	極為會
1 我會令同事甲付出代價。	1	2	3	4	5	6
2 我會疏遠同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6
3 我希望不幸的事會發生在同事甲身上。	1	2	3	4	5	6
4 我會忽視同事甲，使他不存在我的生活中。	1	2	3	4	5	6
5 我不會再信任同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6
6 我希望同事甲得到應得的報應。	1	2	3	4	5	6
7 我會友善地對待同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6
8 我會逃避同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6
9 我會向同事甲取回我應該得到的。	1	2	3	4	5	6
10 我會與同事甲斷絕關係。	1	2	3	4	5	6
11 我不希望見到同事甲受傷害和苦難。	1	2	3	4	5	6
12 我會離開同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6

Department of Psychology

Experimental Scenario 2 - Post-apology Inconsistent Behavior (Post-test)

第二部份 承接著第一部份發生的事件，請繼續閱讀以下接著發生的事，然後回答問題。

幾天後，你去找同事甲吃飯，但他還在開會，你便在他的座位等他。你看到他枱上的投標失敗的報告書，便拿來一看。你看到報告上列出投標失敗的原因，是你堅持要把投標價維持在四十萬港幣。

幾個月後，上司要你和同事甲再度合作，為公司一年一度的大型推廣計劃擬寫計劃書。這一次同事甲又再次在發表計劃書的早上遲到，並在沒有跟你商量下私自把推廣會會場的設計改動了，使成本增加了 25%，他的解釋是他沒有時間通知你。

問題一 請回想在幾個月前，你在第一部份發表計劃書失敗的原因，並參考同事甲在幾天後及幾個月後的行為，你認為以下的句子，在什麼程度上是同事甲的寫照？請按照下列指標圈出你的答案。

	極為不是	頗為不是	略為不是	略為是	頗為是	極為是
1 同事甲在商議中說真話。	1	2	3	4	5	6
2 同事甲是可靠的。	1	2	3	4	5	6
3 同事甲不會誤導我。	1	2	3	4	5	6
4 同事甲靠踩低別人而建立自己的成功。	1	2	3	4	5	6
5 同事甲想與我和解。	1	2	3	4	5	6
6 同事甲嘗試逃避他對別人的承諾。	1	2	3	4	5	6
7 同事甲總是佔著優勢，並支配別人。	1	2	3	4	5	6
8 同事甲想與我重修舊好。	1	2	3	4	5	6
9 同事甲堅持遵守諾言。	1	2	3	4	5	6
10 同事甲專佔那些毫無防範和脆弱的人的便宜。	1	2	3	4	5	6
11 同事甲盡了和我議訂的責任。	1	2	3	4	5	6
12 同事甲言行一致。	1	2	3	4	5	6
13 同事甲想佔我的便宜。	1	2	3	4	5	6
14 同事甲誠實地與我商議。	1	2	3	4	5	6
15 同事甲公平地與我商議雙方的期望。	1	2	3	4	5	6

問題二 請回想在幾個月前，你在第一部份發表計劃書失敗的原因，並參考同事甲在幾天後及幾個月後的行為，你現在認為你有多大可能會對同事甲作出以下的事情？請按照下列指標圈出你的答案。

	極為不會	頗為不會	略為不會	略為會	頗為會	極為會
1 我會逃避同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6
2 我會向同事甲取回我應得的。	1	2	3	4	5	6
3 我會友善地對待同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6
4 我會令同事甲付出代價。	1	2	3	4	5	6
5 我會離開同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6
6 我希望同事甲得到應得的報應。	1	2	3	4	5	6
7 我不希望見到同事甲受傷害和苦難。	1	2	3	4	5	6
8 我會疏遠同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6
9 我會忽視同事甲，使他不存在我的生活中。	1	2	3	4	5	6
10 我會與同事甲斷絕關係。	1	2	3	4	5	6
11 我希望不幸的事會發生在同事甲身上。	1	2	3	4	5	6
12 我不會再信任同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6

第三部份 個人資料

性別： 男性 女性

宗教： 沒有 基督教 天主教 佛教 其他

年齡： 19 歲以下 20 - 29 歲 30 - 39 歲 40 歲或以上

公司業務性質： 商業 非商業

全問卷完。謝謝你對是次人際關係研究的參與和支持。

Debriefing Form

研究目的

近年來有研究調查道歉和饒恕之間的關係。當中有些研究發現道歉可能會提高受害者對冒犯者的饒恕。並且，對於那些擁有敵對個性的人，道歉能促進他們因憤怒而導致的心臟血管病的復原。但是，在辦公室裡，有時候縱使冒犯者在犯錯後道歉，卻沒有得到受害者的饒恕。其中一個解釋是冒犯者道歉後行為的一貫性，即冒犯者在道歉後行為與他之前的道歉是否一致。本研究的目的就是要調查道歉後行為一貫性在冒犯者和受害者之間的信任和饒恕上會否產生影響。曾經有研究結果發現，受害者的道歉後行為一貫性將影響受害者的對其原諒與否的決定，並且受害者與冒犯者之間的信任程度也會受影響。因此，是次研究希望能驗證這一點。

另外，雖然道歉後行為一貫性對社會組織的信任和饒恕有著影響，但對於不同的性質的公司也許有著不同程度影響的。而這項研究就是調查道歉後行為一貫性在非商業組織和企業公司有什麼不同的程度的影響。

閣下提供的所有資料只供學術用途，將絕對保密。

若有任何疑問或者諮詢，歡迎直接與本人 Karina Tsang 聯絡(電話：60765868；電郵地址：karina@hkusua.hku.hk)。如果閣下對作為參與者的權利有任何疑問或者諮詢，請聯絡香港大學的 Human Research Ethics Committee (電話：22415267)。

非常感謝你對是次人際關係研究的支持和參與。

[預備日期：17/ 4/ 2007]

Appendix B

The original Transgression-Related Interpersonal Motivations Scales- 12 Items Form (TRIM-12)

From the following questions, please indicate your current thoughts and feeling about the person who hurt you. Use the following scale to indicate your agreement with each of the questions.

1= Strongly Disagree	2= Disagree	3= Neutral	4= Agree	5= Strongly Agree
----------------------	-------------	------------	----------	-------------------

- 1. I'll make him/ her pay.
- 2. I'll keep as much distance between us as possible.
- 3. I wish that something bad would happen to him/ her.
- 4. I live as if he/ she doesn't exist, isn't around.
- 5. I don't trust him/ her.
- 6. I want him/ her to get what he/ she deserves.
- 7. I find it difficult to act warmly toward him/ her.
- 8. I avoid him/ her.
- 9. I'm going to get even.
- 10. I cut off the relationship with him/ her.
- 11. I want to see him/ her hurt and miserable.
- 12. I withdraw from him/ her.

Source: McCullough, et al. (1998)

Appendix C

The Organizational Trust Inventory – Short Form (OTI– SF)

Please choose the unit of department about which you can most knowledgeable report the opinions of members of your department or unit.

1. Your department or unit is: (enter name of department/ unit)
2. The other department or unit about which you are responding is: (enter name of department/ unit)

Please circle the number to the right of each statement that most clearly describes the opinion of members of your department toward the other department. Interpret the blank spaces as referring to the other department about which you are commenting.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1. We think the people in _____ tell the truth. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. We think that _____ meets its negotiated obligations to our department. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. In our opinion, _____ is reliable. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. We think that the people in _____ succeed by stepping on other people. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. We feel that _____ tries to get the upper hand. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. We think that _____ takes advantage of our problems. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. We feel that _____ negotiates with us honestly. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. We feel that _____ will keep its words. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. We think _____ does not mislead us. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. We feel that _____ tries to get out of its commitments. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. We feel that _____ negotiates joint expectations fairly. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. We feel that _____ takes advantage of people who are vulnerable. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Source: Cummings and Bromiley (1996)

Appendix D

Translated and Modified TRIM-12 in Chinese

你有多大可能會對同事甲作出以下的事情？請按照下列指標圈出你的答案。

	極為不會	頗為不會	略為不會	略為會	頗為會	極為會
1 我會令同事甲付出代價。	1	2	3	4	5	6
2 我會疏遠同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6
3 我希望不幸的事會發生在同事甲身上。	1	2	3	4	5	6
4 我會忽視同事甲，使他不存在我的生活中。	1	2	3	4	5	6
5 我不會再信任同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6
6 我希望同事甲得到應得的報應。	1	2	3	4	5	6
7 我會友善地對待同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6
8 我會逃避同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6
9 我會向同事甲取回我應該得到的。	1	2	3	4	5	6
10 我會與同事甲斷絕關係。	1	2	3	4	5	6
11 我不希望見到同事甲受傷害和苦難。	1	2	3	4	5	6
12 我會離開同事甲。	1	2	3	4	5	6

Source: McCullough, et al. (1998)

Appendix E

Translated and Modified OTI- SF in Chinese

你認為以下的句子，在什麼程度上是同事甲的寫照？請按照下列指標圈出你的答案。

	極為不是	頗為不是	略為不是	略為是	頗為是	極為是
1 同事甲堅持遵守諾言。	1	2	3	4	5	6
2 同事甲想與我和解。	1	2	3	4	5	6
3 同事甲在商議中說真話。	1	2	3	4	5	6
4 同事甲專佔那些毫無防範和脆弱的人的便宜。	1	2	3	4	5	6
5 同事甲是可靠的。	1	2	3	4	5	6
6 同事甲誠實地與我商議。	1	2	3	4	5	6
7 同事甲總是佔著優勢，並支配別人。	1	2	3	4	5	6
8 同事甲言行一致。	1	2	3	4	5	6
9 同事甲公平地與我商議雙方的期望。	1	2	3	4	5	6
10 同事甲靠踩低別人而建立自己的成功。	1	2	3	4	5	6
11 同事甲盡了和我議訂的責任。	1	2	3	4	5	6
12 同事甲想與我重修舊好。	1	2	3	4	5	6
13 同事甲想佔我的便宜。	1	2	3	4	5	6
14 同事甲嘗試逃避他對別人的承諾。	1	2	3	4	5	6
15 同事甲不會誤導我。	1	2	3	4	5	6

Source: Cummings and Bromiley (1996)

Table 1
Average score of level of trust and forgiveness

	Trust				Forgiveness			
	Pre-test		Post-test		Pre-test		Post-test	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Experimental Group 1 (Consistent)	3.43	.54	4.41	.59	3.13	.64	2.49	.73
Experimental Group 2 (Inconsistent)	3.18	.54	2.00	.61	3.16	.73	4.13	.79

Department of Psychology