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ABSTRACT

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTACHMENT AND DEPRESSION:
MEDIATING FACTORS

Name: Hibbard, Kate Clara
University of Dayton

Advisor: Dr. Lee J. Dixon

The current investigation examined various factors that affect one’s likelihood to forgive his or her romantic partner for a specific transgression, and in turn, how not forgiving affect’s one’s well-being. Previous research has shown that there are associations between attachment styles, empathy, rumination, and one’s trait forgiveness (Burnette, Davis, Green, Worthington, & Bradfield, 2009). We hypothesized that these same factors may be associated with episodic forgiveness. Additionally, to our knowledge only one research study found that withholding forgiveness is associated with reduced marital satisfaction, which, in turn, was associated with increased levels of depression (Dixon, Gordon, & Hughes, 2007). We hypothesized that above and beyond ones trait forgiveness, not forgiving a specific transgression would be associated with relationship satisfaction, and in turn, would be associated with depression. Participants (N=209; M= 110, F= 99) completed a battery of self-report questionnaires. Mediational analyses were completed using the Bootstrapping approach (Preacher & Hayes, 2008).
Results revealed that one’s attachment style is associated with one’s current level of empathy and ruminating behaviors, which, in turn, is associated with one’s likelihood to forgive his or her partner for a specific transgression. Additionally, while controlling for one’s tendency to forgive, not forgiving a specific transgression is associated with lower relationship satisfaction, which in turn is associated with higher levels of depression. These findings reveal the influence of one’s attachment style on one’s forgiveness of a transgression and subsequently on one’s mental and relationship health.
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Introduction

Intimate relationships are among the most important and enduring interpersonal relationships; however, it is inevitable that people will experience difficulties at some point during their relationships. It is safe to say those who are closest to us have the greatest ability to hurt us (e.g., Williamson & Gonzales, 2007). Relationship partners use several tools to work through these problems, and forgiveness is one tool used in coping with hurt feelings. Forgiveness has been studied as an important factor in the health of intimate relationships for over two decades (Fenell, 1993). Likewise, a multitude of factors have been linked to forgiveness and its subsequent effects on mental health (Berry, Worthington, O’Conner, Parrott, & Wade, 2005; McCullough, 1998; Toussaint & Webb, 2005). One such factor associated with forgiveness and one’s mental health is one’s attachment style (Burnette, Davis, Green, Worthington, & Bradfield, 2009; Kachadorian, Fincham, & Davila, 2004; Lawler-Row, Younger, Piferi, & Jones, 2006). Specifically, the felt security and closeness in one’s intimate relationship may contribute significantly to the quality of one’s mental health. The purpose of this study is to understand how certain factors link one’s attachment style and forgiveness to one’s mental health.
Forgiveness

Many researchers have described forgiveness as a prosocial change in a victim’s thoughts, emotions, motivation and/or behaviors toward a transgressor for a specific transgression (Boon & Sulsky, 1997; Enright & Fitzgibbons, 2000; Fincham, Paleari, Regalia, 2002; Hope, 1987; McCullough, 2001). This prosocial change allows a person to reduce the need to seek revenge for past insults or disappointments through a reframing process. This process involves showing compassion, unconditional worth, and generosity. When people forgive, they counteract the motivations to avoid the transgressor or seek revenge so that they can increase the likelihood of restoring their relationship (McCullough, 2001). Unsurprisingly, mutual forgiveness has been found to be a pivotal point for clients to find renewal within a relationship (Worthington & DiBlasio, 1990). Not only has forgiveness been found to be relationally beneficial, forgiveness has also been found to be linked to greater mental and physical health (e.g., Witvliet, Ludwig, & Vander Laan, 2001; Worthington & DiBlasio, 1990).

It is important to address the difference between trait forgiveness and episodic forgiveness. Allemand, Amberg, and Zimprich (2007) describe episodic forgiveness as forgiveness related to a specific interpersonal transgression episode. In contrast, trait forgiveness refers to how much a person tends to forgive across all situations (Berry et al., 2005; McCullough, Bellah, Kilpatrick, & Johnson, 2001). Trait forgiveness has been found to be correlated with several personality factors. For example, Berry, Worthington, Parrott, O’Connor, & Wade (2001) found that trait forgiveness is negatively correlated
with neuroticism and rumination, while positively correlated with agreeableness and extroversion. Other personality factors have also been linked to trait forgiveness; it is negatively related to narcissism and positively to empathy (Burnette et al., 2009; Eaton, Struthers, & Santelli, 2006). Moreover, trait forgiveness has also been associated with a person’s well being; decreased levels of trait forgiveness are associated with increased levels of depressive symptoms (Brown, 2003; Lawler-Row & Piferi, 2006). Episodic forgiveness has been found to be influenced by characteristics of the transgression (e.g., severity) and relational context (e.g., satisfaction, commitment, relationship closeness; Fincham, Jackson, & Beach, 2005), as well as personal characteristics, such as the tendency to ruminate and to show empathy (McCullough, Worthington, & Rachal, 1997; McCullough et al., 1998).

Empathy has been defined as the vicarious experience of another person’s emotional state, while other researchers have defined it as a specific emotion characterized by compassion and sympathy (Enright & Fitzgibbons, 2000; McCullough, 2001). McCullough et al. (1998), along with many other researchers, have found that empathy is strongly correlated with the extent to which a victim forgives their transgressor (Fincham et al., 2002; Kachadourian et al., 2004). As a person forgives they start to relinquish resentment and begin feeling more empathy for a person. However, it is difficult for some people to experience empathy because they do not feel safe around the offender (Enright & Fitzgibbons, 2000).

**Factors Associated with Attachment**

**Empathy and attachment.** Individuals who have an avoidant attachment style (one of three attachment styles; Bowlby 1969, 1982) are less likely to empathize
(Weinfield, Sroufe, Egeland, & Carlson, 1999) because they do not feel a sense of closeness to their romantic partner. Avoidant attachment individuals have a difficult time getting close to their romantic partner. These individuals do not allow themselves to depend on their partner and they are not confident in others’ availability (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Collins & Read, 1990). Given this likelihood, it is not surprising that Burnette et al. (2009) found that the relationship between avoidant attachment and trait forgiveness is fully mediated by one’s level of empathy. Specifically, those with an avoidant attachment style are less likely to empathize with their transgressor, which, in turn, is associated with reduced trait forgiveness. Avoidant attachment individuals downplay the worth of their romantic relationships and even the worth of their partner; therefore, they do not want to invest time in managing or healing their relationships once the trust has been betrayed.

Burnette et al. (2009) examined how trait empathy mediates the relationship between attachment style and trait forgiveness. Adding to this research, the goal of this study was to assess whether or not the relationship between attachment style and episodic forgiveness is mediated by empathy felt for the transgressor (specific empathy). I predicted that specific empathy would mediate the relationship between attachment style (particularly avoidant) and episodic forgiveness. Specifically, I predicted that avoidant attachment would be associated with reduced empathy, which, in turn, would be associated with reduced forgiveness (Hypothesis 1).

**Rumination and attachment.** Another factor found to be related to forgiveness is rumination. McCullough et al. (1998) found that specific rumination over intrusive
thoughts, images, and emotions related to an interpersonal offense maintains a person’s distress regarding the offense. The act of ruminating can also increase a person’s motivation to avoid contact with and seek revenge against the offender, which may affect a person’s ability to forgive. Furthermore, Berry et al. (2005) found that the act of ruminating can inhibit one’s ability to forgive their transgressor. Similarly, research has shown that trait forgiveness is negatively correlated with trait rumination (Berry et al., 2001).

Rumination and anxious attachment are relationship constructs that play an important role in the forgiveness process (e.g. Burnette et al., 2009; McCullough, Bono, & Root, 2007). People who are anxiously attached are characterized by their obsessive preoccupation with their romantic partners, heightened jealousy, and more self-doubts. While they are comfortable with closeness, they also are constantly worried about being abandoned, unloved, and rejected by their romantic partners (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Campbell, Simpson, Boldry, & Kashy, 2005; Collins & Read, 1990). Research has found anxious attachment and trait forgiveness are partially mediated by rumination; specifically, those high in anxious attachment tend to ruminate more about a transgression, which is then associated with reduced forgiveness (Burnette et al., 2009). Burnette et al. (2009) proposed their results could be due to the fact that people high in attachment anxiety struggle to forgive because they engage in rumination that is often fearful in nature. This underlying fear stems from the individual feeling his or her romantic relationship is not safe. Subsequently, if they are transgressed against it may increase their fear and may lead to an increase in rumination. As a result, individuals with
this type of attachment may view a transgression as more evidence that the romantic partner is unavailable and untrustworthy, which may make them less willing to forgive (Campbell et al., 2005). Unfortunately, withholding forgiveness may detrimentally impact the couple’s satisfaction with their relationship (Enright & Fitzgibbon, 2000).

In contrast to Burnette et al. (2009), who looked at trait rumination and trait forgiveness, the goal of the current study is to assess whether or not the relationship between attachment style and episodic forgiveness is mediated by rumination over a specific transgression (specific rumination). I predicted that specific rumination would mediate the relationship between attachment style (particularly anxious) and episodic forgiveness. Specifically, I predicted that anxious attachment would be associated with greater specific rumination, which, in turn, would be associated with reduced forgiveness (Hypothesis 2).

The current study assessed a person’s general attachment style because research has shown that a person’s attachment style at ages 15 and 16 continued to predict attachment style at age 25 (Simpson, Collins, Tran, and Haydon, 2007). Simpson and colleagues (2007) found that as romantic relationships continue to develop and become more serious, the direct influences of family interaction on attachment decreases and the romantic partner’s interactions begin to have more of an impact. Provided that the current study used college students, some of the partners may have had less time to develop an attachment style toward their romantic partner and therefore, may still be influenced by their family interactions on attachment.
Relationship Satisfaction, Forgiveness, & Depression

**Relationship Satisfaction and Forgiveness.** Research on relationship satisfaction and forgiveness has found that those with a greater tendency to forgive their partners’ transgressions reported higher scores on relationship satisfaction (Kachadourian et al., 2004). Additionally, the lack of forgiveness, as evidenced by higher avoidance of the transgressor and higher revenge motivation, has been found to be negatively related to relationship satisfaction (McCullough et al., 1998). Research has also shown that marital quality can predict the likelihood of forgiveness, meaning the more positive partners rated their relationship, the more likely they were to forgive their transgressor (Fincham et al., 2002). While there is some evidence that this relationship may be cyclical, longitudinal research has also shown that forgiveness of a transgression leads to an increase in feelings of closeness and commitment toward one’s partner (Tsang, McCullough, & Fincham, 2006).

**Relationship Satisfaction and Depression.** Past research on relationship satisfaction and depression has found that higher scores on depression were significantly correlated with lower scores on relationship satisfaction (Burns, Sayers, & Moras, 1994; Kuan Mak, Bond, Simpson, & Rholes, 2010; St. John & Montgomery, 2009). After experiencing a humiliating marital event (e.g., husband’s infidelity or a threat of the husband leaving), Cano and O'Leary (2000) found that wives were six times more likely to be diagnosed with a Major Depressive Episode. Given this research, it is not surprising that a happy relationship, especially a marital relationship, has been shown to be a
protective factor against developing depressive symptoms (Uebelacker & Whisman, 2006).

Although theorists have presented several theoretical perspectives about the causal link between relationship satisfaction and depression, it is evident that at some point there is a bi-directional relationship between these two constructs (Kouros, Papp, & Cummings, 2008). Kouros et al. (2008), as expected, found that changes in marital satisfaction predicted depressive symptoms, such that decreased marital satisfaction over time predicted increased levels of depressive symptoms. Conversely, increased depressive symptoms over time predicted lower levels of marital satisfaction.

**Forgiveness and Depression.** Toussaint, Williams, Musick, and Emerson-Rose (2008) along with Toussaint and Webb (2005) found that there is an inverse relationship between depression and trait forgiveness. These findings are consistent with Brown’s (2003) results, which demonstrated that, in dating couples, the tendency to forgive was negatively correlated with depression. Even among individuals not in relationships, research found that the tendency to forgive was negatively associated with depression, for both men and women (Maltby, Macaskill, & Day, 2001; Webb, Colburn, Heisler, Call, & Chickerings, 2008).

Research has also shown how episodic forgiveness can influence depressive symptoms. Reed & Enright (2006) evaluated the effects of forgiveness therapy on depression in women who had experienced spousal abuse, and found that after the training was completed the women showed a significant decrease in depressive symptoms. Furthermore, individuals who experienced a divorce and who had not yet
been able to forgive their ex-spouse reported higher levels of depression (Rye, Folck, Heim, Olszewski, & Traina, 2004). A longitudinal study by Orcutt (2006) found that among college-aged women, those who had experienced a transgression and were not able to forgive the transgressor, developed higher levels of depression.

Surprisingly, to our knowledge only one research study (Dixon, Gordon, & Hughes, 2007) that has yet to be published has assessed how the relationship between the forgiveness of a specific transgression and depressive symptoms could be mediated by a person’s satisfaction with his or her romantic relationship with the transgressor. Dixon et al. (2007) found that forgiveness of one’s partner is associated with an increase in marital satisfaction, which is associated with reduced levels of depression. Adding to this research, I predicted that relationship satisfaction would mediate the relationship between episodic forgiveness and depression in individuals who were in a romantic relationship, but not married. Specifically, I predicted not having forgiven one’s partner would be associated with lower relationship satisfaction, which would ultimately lead to increased depressive symptoms (Hypothesis 3A).

Although Dixon et al. (2007) found that marital satisfaction mediates the relationship between episodic forgiveness and depression; their findings may be attributable to one’s disposition to forgive, independently of whether or not one has forgiven a specific betrayal. It may be that an individual has a forgiving personality and when a transgression occurs, it may be the forgiving personality that fosters better mental health. It also may be that even when considering the forgiving personality, it is forgiveness of the specific event that is associated with lower levels of depression.
Highlighted previously, forgiveness and depression are highly related and each are influenced by other personality factors (Berry et al., 2001; Brose, Rye, Lutz-Zois, & Ross, 2005; Kendler & Myers, 2010). For example, trait and episodic forgiveness have been found to be negatively correlated with neuroticism (Brose et al., 2005; Wang, 2008). Similarly, researchers have shown increased levels of neuroticism as a predictor of increased levels of depression (Enns & Cox, 2005; Kendler & Myers, 2010). Even though research has shown that forgiveness is linked to various personality traits (e.g., empathy, rumination, neuroticism, agreeableness; Eaton et al., 2006; Berry et al., 2001; Burnette et al., 2009) that are also related to depression, it may be that even above and beyond these engrained traits, not forgiving a specific transgression may lead to lower relationship satisfaction, which in turn may lead to higher levels of depression. Thus, I predicted that above and beyond one’s tendency to forgive, not having forgiven a partner’s offense would be associated with reduced levels of relationship satisfaction, which would, in turn, be associated with greater levels of depression (Hypothesis 3B).

It is my hope that the findings of the current study will significantly add to the growing research evaluating the importance of the effects of attachment styles on the ability to forgive. In this study, we examined the mediating role of specific empathy and specific rumination in the relationship between attachment styles (anxious and avoidant) and episodic forgiveness. Specifically, it was expected that the attachment style would be associated with empathy and rumination. Further, decreased empathy would be associated with reduced forgiveness, while increased ruminative behaviors would also be associated with reduced forgiveness. Additionally, the current study assessed the
mediating role that relationship satisfaction plays in the relationship between episodic forgiveness and depression. It was expected that we would find that the relationship between a person forgiving his or her partner and the amount of depressive symptoms he or she experienced would be mediated by relationship satisfaction. While taking into account one’s disposition to forgive, we proposed when someone had not forgiven a specific transgression this would predict lower levels of relationship satisfaction, which would be associated with increased levels of depression.
Method

Participants

The following analyses were based on the responses of 209 (Males = 110, Females = 99) undergraduate students’ from introductory psychology classes from a medium-sized Midwestern Catholic university. All of the participants (N=209) were given questionnaires that included all but the attachment measure, however a subsample (N=138) were given questionnaires that contained all measures. Consequently, 138 participants were included for the analyses of hypotheses 1 and 2, while hypotheses 3a and 3b included 209 participants.

This sample size was determined by using the G*power analysis program to detect a small effect size of .20 (Cohen, 1992; Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007). The participants were required to be in a heterosexual, romantic relationship in order to participate. The average length of relationship was 18 months. The average age of participants was 19 (SD = 2.7) years. Further, the vast majority of participants were Caucasian (84%); 4.2% were Asian or Pacific Islander, 4.2% were Latino/a, 3.3% were African-American, .5% were Native-American, and 2.4% were from other ethnic groups. Participants were recruited via a central website that is used by the psychology department to communicate research opportunities to introductory psychology students. In return for their participation in the study, the students received a required experimental credit toward their psychology class.
Measures

**Forgiveness.** The Transgression-Related Interpersonal Motivations Inventory–18 Inventory (TRIM-18; McCullough, Root, & Cohen, 2006; McCullough et al., 1998) was used to assess the participant’s episodic forgiveness. The TRIM-18 includes a seven-item Avoidance subscale that measures motivation to avoid a transgressor (e.g., “I live as if he/she doesn’t exist, isn’t around”) and the five-item Revenge subscale measures motivation to seek revenge (e.g., “I’ll make him/her pay”). For this measure, participants completed a 5-point Likert-type scale to indicate how much they agree or disagree with items related to their current motivation to avoid and to seek revenge against their transgressor. These subscales have shown adequate internal consistency estimates with a Cronbach’s alpha ranging from .85 to .93 for all measurement occasions and test–retest reliability estimates ranging from .44 to .63 across all measurement occasions (McCullough et al., 2001; McCullough et al., 1998). This measure has shown that the avoidance and revenge subscales had correlations of -.41 and -.67, respectively, with a single-item measure of forgiving, indicating adequate construct validity. These subscales also indicated convergent and discriminant validity through correlations with measures of offense-specific rumination, empathy, and relational closeness and low correlations with measures of social desirability (McCullough et al., 1998). The TRIM-18 has a third subscale that was not used in previous versions of the TRIM: a six-item subscale for measuring benevolence motivation (e.g., “Even though his/her actions hurt me, I have goodwill for him/her”) that also has internal consistency estimates ranging from .91 to .93. Test–retest correlations ranged from .52 to .87 (McCullough, Fincham, & Tsang,
2003; McCullough & Hoyt, 2002). These 6 items are rated on the same 5-point Likert-type scale as the 12 avoidance and revenge items. Currently, there does not appear to be any evidence of construct validity for the benevolence subscale (please see appendix A). In the current sample the Revenge and Benevolent subscales demonstrated adequate reliability with both having a Cronbach’s alpha of .85 and the Avoidant subscale had a Cronbach’s alpha of .69.

**Rumination.** The Intrusiveness Scale for Rumination-Inspired by Impact Event Scale (McCullough, Orsulak, Brandon, & Akers, 2007) is an 8-item scale that was inspired by the Intrusiveness subscale of the Impact of Events Scale (Horowitz, Wilner, & Alvarez, 1979). Participants rated on a 6-point scale ranging from 0 (not at all true of me) to 5 (extremely true of me) how much they had the following experiences in the last 2 weeks (e.g., “I couldn’t stop thinking about what he/she did to me”, “Thoughts and feelings about how he/she hurt me kept running through my head”, “Strong feelings about what this person did to me kept bubbling up”, “Images of the offense kept coming back to me”). This scale has shown high internal consistency, with a Cronbach’s alpha of .94 and moderate test–retest stability ranging from .24 to .82 across five measurement occasions (McCullough et al., 2007). Although formal construct validity has not been examined for this measure, it has shown to be associated in the expected directions with constructs such as rumination, avoidance, and revenge (McCullough et al., 2007; please see appendix B). In the current sample this scale demonstrated adequate internal reliability, with a Cronbach’s alpha of .86.
**Empathy.** The Batson’s Eight Item Empathy Scale (Archer, Diaz-Loving, Gollwitzer, Davis, & Foushee, 1981; Batson, Bolin, Cross, & Neuringer-Benefiel, 1986; Batson, O’Quin, Fultz, Vanderplas, Isen, 1983; Coke, Batson & McDavis, 1978; Fultz, Batson, Fortenbach, McCarthy, & Varney, 1986; Toi & Batson, 1982; McCullough et. al. 1997) is an 8-item measure in which participants rated, on a 6-point scale that ranged from 0 (*not at all*) to 5 (*extremely*), the degree to which they felt each affect (sympathetic, empathic, concerned, moved, compassionate, warm, softhearted, and tender) for their offender at the time of the rating. There is adequate internal consistency with this measure; estimates have ranged from a Cronbach’s alpha of .79 to .95 (Batson et al., 1983; Coke et al., 1978; McCullough et. al. 1997; Toi & Batson, 1982). The scale has shown to be moderately correlated with helping behavior, which lends support for construct validity (Coke et al., 1978; please see appendix C). In the current sample this scale demonstrated adequate reliability, with a Cronbach’s alpha of .86.

**Attachment.** Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised (ECR-R; Fraley, Waller, & Brennan, 2000) is a scale composed of 36 items that assessed attachment anxiety and avoidance. The measure consists of two subscales, Anxiety (e.g., “I worry about being abandoned”) and Avoidance (e.g., “Just when my partner starts to get close, I find myself pulling away”). Responses were assessed on a 7-point scale, with scores ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*. This measure has high internal consistency, with a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for attachment anxiety of .92 and .95 for attachment avoidance (Fraley et al., 2000). The anxiety and avoidance subscales for the Relationship Questionnaire were positively correlated ($r = .69$, $r = .45$, respectively) with
the ECR-R (Sibley, Fischer, & Liu, 2005; please see appendix D). In the current sample the scale demonstrated adequate reliability for attachment anxiety with a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .89 and acceptable reliability for attachment avoidance with a Cronbach’s alpha of .73.

**Trait Forgiveness.** The Trait Forgivingness Scale (TFS; Berry et al., 2005) is a 10-item that was used to measure trait forgivingness (e.g., “I can usually forgive and forget an insult,” “I am a forgiving person”). Each item was measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale (ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). This measure assessed the respondent’s self-appraisal of his or her proneness to forgive interpersonal transgressions. The TFS was adapted from a 15-item scale used to assess trait forgivingness, relationship quality, and cortisol stress responses (Berry & Worthington, 2001). The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient has ranged from .74 to .80 and the test-retest reliability estimate is .78 (Berry et al., 2005). Concurrent construct validity was indicated by the statistically significant correlation between the self-rating on the TFS and the Transgression Narrative Test of Forgiveness ($r = .50$; Berry et al., 2005; please see appendix E). With the current sample the scale demonstrated acceptable internal consistency, with a Cronbach’s alpha of .74.

**Relationship Satisfaction.** The Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS; Hendrick, 1988) is a 7-item measure of relationship satisfaction (e.g., “In general, how satisfied are you with your relationship?”). Each item was measured on a 5-point Likert scale with different verbal labels for each item. For example, the labels were “poorly” (1), “average” (3) and “very well” (5) for the first item and “unsatisfied” (1), “average” (3) and “very
satisfied” (5) for the second item. Higher scores indicate greater relationship satisfaction. RAS has been found to have an alpha reliability of .86 (Hendrick, 1988) and a seven-week test–retest reliability of .85 (Hendrick, Dicke, & Hendrick, 1998). This scale has been shown to correlate .80 with the more widely used 32-item Spanier (1976) Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Hendrick, 1988; please see appendix F). In the current sample the scale has acceptable internal consistency, with a Cronbach’s alpha of .73.

**Depression.** The Center for Epidemiological Studies- Depression Scale (CESD; Radloff, 1977) is a 20-item measure used to assess depressive symptomatology (e.g., “I was bothered by things that don’t usually bother me,” “I felt that everything I did was an effort”). Respondents were asked to consider how they had felt within the last week and responses ranged from 1 = *less than 1 day* to 4 = *most or all of the time*. It has been shown to have adequate test–retest reliability. For husbands, the Cronbach’s alpha ranged from .83-.87, and the wives’ Cronbach’s alpha ranged from .87-.91 (Kuoros et al., 2008). During initial research with the scale, the CESD correlated significantly and positively with another measure of depression, Hamilton’s (1960) Clinician’s Rating Scale ($r=.44$). The CESD was shown further to discriminate between general and patient populations, with significantly higher mean scores noted for patient groups (Radloff, 1977; please see appendix G). In the current sample the scale has acceptable internal consistency, with a Cronbach’s alpha of .78.

**Distraction Measures**

**Rejection Sensitivity.** The Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire (RSQ; Downey & Feldman, 1996) consists of 18 hypothetical situations in which rejection by a significant
other is possible (e.g., ‘‘You ask a friend to do you a big favor’’). For each situation, participants were first asked to indicate their degree of concern or anxiety about the outcome of the situation (e.g., ‘‘How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your friend would want to help you out?’’) on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (very unconcerned) to 6 (very concerned). Participants then indicated the likelihood that the other person would respond in an accepting manner (e.g., ‘‘I would expect that he/she would willingly agree to help me out’’) on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (very unlikely) to 6 (very likely).

**Silencing the Self.** The Silencing the Self Scale (SSS; Jack & Dill, 1992) is a scale that consists of 31 items that are divided into four separate factors: silencing the self, externalized self-perception, care as self-sacrifice, and divided self. This scale was initially created to assess women’s schemas regarding intimacy, but since then has been found to be useful for both men and women (e.g., Flett, Besser, Hewitt, & Davis, 2007; please see appendix I).

**Anger.** State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory – State Scale (Spielberger, 1988) is a scale that is a modified version of an inventory designed to measure subjects’ current experience of anger (please see appendix J).

**Demographic/Background Information.** Each participant completed a questionnaire evaluating demographic information. Items are related to gender, race, and relationship status (please see appendix K).
Procedure

The questionnaires were administered to groups no larger than 30 participants and the participants were asked to not sit with each other or to look at other participants’ answers. The participants began the study by filling out an informed consent (please see Appendix L).

There were three sections to our procedure. Given that we were looking for trait forgiveness and episodic forgiveness, it was necessary to reduce any priming effects. It was important that when thinking about the participant’s tendency to forgive, the participant is not purposefully trying to match this tendency with how the participant is feeling toward the specific transgression. Therefore, in the first section, participants first filled out the trait forgiveness, depression, relationship satisfaction, and attachment questionnaires in that order. The second section acted as a break from the actual study in order to allow time between assessing trait forgiveness from episodic forgiveness. During this section, participants completed three questionnaires that were related to the constructs we are a studying; however, they were not central to our study. These include silencing the self, rejection sensitivity, and anger questionnaires in that order. During the third section, participants completed the episodic forgiveness, empathy, rumination, and demographic questionnaires in that order.

After the participants finished the seven questionnaires, the administrator gave the participants a debriefing form (please see appendix M). All of the measures used in this study are in the public domain.
Results

Prior to the analyses that follow, missing values were replaced with the participants average response to items on the same scale, however only when 80% of the scale items had been completed. There were no more than 4% missing values for any one item. Mean values, standard deviations, and ranges are presented in Table 1 and the correlations among all the measures are presented in Table 2.

Bootstrap procedures described by Preacher and Hayes (2008) were used for mediational analyses and is currently recommended as best practice with small sample sizes (e.g., Preacher & Hayes, 2008; Shrout & Bolger, 2002). Additionally, this method is preferred because it does not assume normality of the distribution of the indirect effects and therefore reduce Type II error, compared to procedures such as the Sobel test (Preacher and Hayes, 2008). The reported results are based upon bias corrected and accelerated confidence intervals which were set at 0.95 with 1000 resamples. If the values of the estimated effect sizes within the confidence interval include zero, this indicates a nonsignificant effect.
Table 1

Summary of Means and Standard Deviations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TFS</td>
<td>34.04</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>10-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESD</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>0-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAS</td>
<td>28.31</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>7-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>36.18</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>8-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumination</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>0-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attach Anxious</td>
<td>61.72</td>
<td>19.90</td>
<td>18-126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attach Avoidant</td>
<td>62.09</td>
<td>18.16</td>
<td>18-126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM-Revenge</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>6-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM-Avoidant</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>6-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM-Benevolent</td>
<td>24.03</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>6-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. TFS= Trait Forgiveness Scale; CESD= Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale; RAS= Relationship Assessment Scale; Empathy= Batson’s Eight Item Empathy Scale; Rumination= Intrusiveness Scale for Ruminaton-Inspired by Impact Event Scale; Attach= Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised; TRIM= Transgression-Related Interpersonal Motivations Inventory.
Table 2

*Summary of Intercorrelations for all Study Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.TFS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.CESD</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.RAS</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Empathy</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.Rumination</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.Attach Anxious</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.Attach Avoidant</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.TRIM- Revenge</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.TRIM- Avoidant</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.TRIM- Benevolent</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>-.62**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* See previous note for clarification of variable names. *p < .01, **p < .001*
Analyses of Major Study Questions

**Hypothesis 1.** Mediation analysis was used to investigate whether or not the relationship between attachment style and episodic forgiveness was mediated by empathy felt for the transgressor (specific empathy). Three simple mediation models were constructed with avoidant attachment as the predictor, specific empathy as the mediator, and the three subscales of episodic forgiveness as the outcomes. Confirming this hypothesis, the indirect effect for specific empathy was significant for the benevolence and avoidant subscales. The benevolence subscale showed a point estimate of \(-0.0185, z = -1.85, p = 0.06, S.E. = .0116\), and a 95% BCa bootstrap CI of \(-0.0526\) to \(-0.0024\); the avoidant subscale showed a point estimate of \(0.0175, z = 1.64, p = 0.10, S.E. = .0119\) and a 95% BCa bootstrap CI of \(0.0004\) to \(0.0470\); and the revenge subscale showed a point estimate of \(0.0047, z = 1.20, p < 0.05, S.E. = .0045\) and a 95% BCa bootstrap CI of \(-0.0014\) to \(0.0158\). These results indicate that empathy mediated the relationship between avoidant attachment and the benevolence subscale for episodic forgiveness. Similarly, empathy mediated the relationship between the avoidant attachment subscale and the avoidant subscale for episodic forgiveness. Empathy did not mediate the relationship between avoidant attachment and the revenge subscale for episodic forgiveness.
Figure 1a. Simple mediation model for the avoidant attachment measure: path estimates for the indirect effect of avoidant attachment on the episodic forgiveness benevolence subscale.

Hypothesis 2. Mediation analysis was used to assess whether or not the relationship between anxious attachment style and episodic forgiveness was mediated by rumination over a specific transgression (specific rumination). Three simple mediation models were constructed with anxious attachment as the predictor, specific rumination as
the mediator, and the three subscales of episodic forgiveness as the outcomes. The indirect effect for specific rumination was significant for each of the three subscales. The benevolence subscale showed a point estimate of -.0191, $z = -2.29$, $p < 0.05$, $S.E. = .0098$, and a 95% BCa bootstrap CI of -.0452 to -.0050; the avoidant subscale showed a point estimate of .0269, $z = 2.14$, $p < 0.05$, $S.E. = .0153$ and a 95% BCa bootstrap CI of .0029 to .0615; and the revenge subscale showed a point estimate of .0127, $z = 2.17$, $p < 0.05$, $S.E. = .0071$ and a 95% BCa bootstrap CI of .0021 to .0311. These results indicate that rumination mediated the relationship between anxious attachment and each of the subscales of episodic forgiveness, supporting this hypothesis.

**Figure 2a.** Simple mediation model for the anxious attachment measure: path estimates for the indirect effect of anxious attachment on the episodic forgiveness benevolence subscale.

**Figure 2b.** Simple mediation model for the anxious attachment measure: path estimates for the indirect effect of anxious attachment on the episodic forgiveness avoidant subscale.
Hypothesis 3A. Mediational analysis was used to assess whether or not the relationship between episodic forgiveness and depression was mediated by relationship satisfaction. Three simple mediation models were constructed with each of the three subscales of episodic forgiveness as the predictor, relationship satisfaction as the mediator, and depression as the outcome variable. The indirect effect for relationship satisfaction was significant with each of three subscales. The benevolence subscale showed a point estimate of -.1172, \( z = -2.52, p < 0.05, S.E. = .0546 \), and a 95% BCa bootstrap CI of -.2252 to -.0233; the avoidant subscale showed a point estimate of .0700, \( z = 2.48, p < 0.05, S.E. = .0374 \) and a 95% BCa bootstrap CI of .0165 to .1631; and the revenge subscale showed a point estimate of .1402, \( z = 2.40, p < 0.05, S.E. = .0645 \) and a 95% BCa bootstrap CI of .0301 to .2807. As expected, the results indicate that relationship satisfaction mediates the relationship between each of the subscales of episodic forgiveness and depression, supporting this hypothesis.
**Hypothesis 3B.** A mediational analysis was used to evaluate if beyond a person’s tendency to forgive, the relationship between not having forgiven one’s partner’s offense and one’s levels of depression, is mediated by one’s relationship satisfaction. The indirect effect for relationship satisfaction, while controlling for trait forgiveness, was significant with each of three subscales. The indirect effect for relationship satisfaction, while
controlling for trait forgiveness, was significant with each of three subscales. The benevolence subscale showed a point estimate of \(-0.0880, z = -1.88, p < 0.05, S.E. = 0.0468\), and a 95% BCa bootstrap CI of \(-0.1918\) to \(-0.0119\); the avoidant subscale showed a point estimate of \(0.0541, z = 1.64, p < 0.05, S.E. = 0.0330\) and a 95% BCa bootstrap CI of \(0.0052\) to \(0.1302\); and the revenge subscale showed a point estimate of \(0.1032, z = 1.88, p < 0.05, S.E. = 0.0550\) and a 95% BCa bootstrap CI of \(0.0196\) to \(0.2472\). The results indicate that relationship satisfaction mediated the relationship between each of the subscales of episodic forgiveness and depression, while controlling for trait forgiveness, providing statistical support for this hypothesis.

**Figure 4a.** Simple mediation model for the episodic forgiveness benevolence subscale: path estimates for the indirect effect of the episodic forgiveness benevolence subscale on depression (controlling for trait forgiveness).

**Figure 4b.** Simple mediation model for the episodic forgiveness avoidant subscale: path estimates for the indirect effect of the episodic forgiveness avoidant subscale on depression (controlling for trait forgiveness).
Figure 4c. Simple mediation model for the episodic forgiveness revenge subscale: path estimates for the indirect effect of the episodic forgiveness revenge subscale on depression (controlling for trait forgiveness).
**Discussion**

This study’s primary aim was to better understand the association between attachment style and mental health. In an effort to examine this question, this study had three objectives. One was to examine whether or not rumination and empathy mediated the association between attachment and episodic forgiveness. The second was to examine whether or not relationship satisfaction mediated the relationship between episodic forgiveness and depression. The third objective was to examine the association outlined in the second objective, while taking into account one’s general tendency to forgive.

With regard to the first objective of the study, my findings are consistent with past research. It was shown that empathy mediated the relationship between avoidant attachment and episodic forgiveness. Specifically, it was found that when one has a more avoidant attachment style one is less likely to experience empathy toward the offending partner and, in return, is more likely to be motivated to avoid the partner. It is understandable that when one thinks one’s partner is untrustworthy they would experience less empathy, and consequently would seek to avoid the partner. Conversely, individuals with less avoidant attachment showed more empathy toward their offending partners, which was associated with showing goodwill and a desire to forgive their partners. These findings add to prior work from Burnette and colleagues (2009), who, as mentioned above, found that the relationship between avoidant attachment style and trait forgiveness, was mediated by empathy. Interestingly, although an offended partner who
has a more avoidant attachment style experiences less empathy toward the offending partner, empathy was not associated with a motivation to seek revenge. In some ways it is understandable that no significant link was found in this case, considering that past research has shown that those with an avoidant attachment style do not invest a lot of time in their relationship and may not find it worth their time to seek revenge (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Collins & Read, 1990; Enright & Fitzgibbons, 2000). Furthermore, those with more of an avoidant attachment desire emotional distance from their partners and tend to make efforts to be independent and remain in control (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2002). Given this need, it may not be desirable to seek revenge and show concern for their intimate relationship.

As predicted, it was found that the relationship between anxious attachment and episodic forgiveness was mediated by rumination. When an anxiously attached partner is transgressed against, it was shown the partner will continue to think and brood over the transgression, which may encourage the partner to seek revenge against the offending partner, and may push one away from the offending partner. Unsurprisingly, results revealed that a transgressed partner who has less of an anxious attachment style will show less ruminating behaviors, and in turn, will show a motivation for goodwill and kindness. Again, the results are consistent with Burnette and colleagues’ (2009) findings. As previously mentioned, Burnette et al. (2009) found that rumination mediated the relationship between anxious attachment and trait forgiveness. It may be the case that even though the offended partner is hurt, they are able to think less about the event, which may allow a partner to move forward from the event and therefore encourage
forgiveness. Furthermore, it is conceivable that individuals with less of an anxious attachment style might be able to effectively communicate their emotions toward their partner regarding the negative event, and therefore might be able to decrease ruminating behaviors (e.g., Anders & Tucker, 2000).

Past research has shown that individuals’ attachment style is associated with their general tendencies (e.g., to ruminate, show empathy, forgive) in a certain way (Burnette et al., 2009). However, what research had not shown was if this same pattern of behaviors would hold true when examining a specific transgression against a romantic partner. My results indicate that indeed the same pattern of behaviors holds true both at the specific level and the general level. Taken together, these results allude to the notion that an individual’s general tendencies with respect to these constructs are concurrent with how they cope with individual circumstances.

When considering the third goal of the study, my results were consistent with previous research (Dixon et al., 2007). I found that not having forgiven one’s partner for a specific offense is shown to be associated with reduced relationship satisfaction, which in turn, is associated with increased levels of depression. As it turns out, whether or not one is in a marital relationship or a committed non-marital relationship, when one does not forgive their partner their satisfaction in their relationship, and subsequently their well being, is negatively affected. This results adds to previous research highlighting that happiness in one’s relationship is a protective factor against experiencing depressive symptoms (e.g., Uebelacker & Whisman, 2006).
Additionally, mediational analyses supported the proposed model predicting that the association between forgiveness of a specific transgression and depression would be mediated by relationship satisfaction, while controlling for trait forgiveness. Trait forgiveness is a personality trait that has been shown to be associated with several other personality traits such as neuroticism and agreeableness (e.g., Brose et al., 2005). Additionally, these same traits have been shown to be connected with depression (e.g., Kendler & Myers, 2010). Thus, possessing a forgiving personality, and all that it ensues, may in and of itself cause a person to be less prone to depression, independent of whether or not a person is harboring unforgiveness. However, this study has shown that above and beyond one’s ingrained forgiving personality, harboring unforgiveness for a transgression that has occurred is associated with having more depressive symptoms, and that this relationship is mediated by one’s relationship satisfaction. In other words, not forgiving one’s partner is associated with lower levels of satisfaction with the relationship one has with said partner, independently of how forgiving this person tends to be. Furthermore, not being satisfied with the relationship is predictive of one’s mental well-being.

The clinical implications of these findings are that forgiveness issues may have significant consequences for mental health. Facilitating forgiveness and subsequently improving one’s relationship satisfaction would appear to be beneficial for most clients. It is apparent that helping a client to empathize and understand the client’s partner may encourage forgiveness. At the same time, rumination about negative events can enable negative emotions triggered by the negative event and hinder the forgiving process (Greenberg, 1995). This being said, clinicians may also want to encourage their clients to
reduce their negative ruminating behaviors and learn to move forward from the event. Moreover, knowing a client’s attachment style may help the clinician understand how the client might process the negative event (e.g., rumination, show less empathy), which would then help the clinician understand how to intervene to help in the forgiveness process.

The results of this study also highlight the role that forgiving a specific transgression can play on a couple’s relationship health and personal health. Clinicians are advised to consider focusing therapeutic goals on coping with the actual event that triggered dissatisfaction in their relationship. While a client may possess certain personality traits that would either encourage or hinder one’s ability to forgive (e.g., neuroticism, agreeableness, empathy, rumination), it may not foster forgiveness as much as addressing the specific transgression.

Some important limitations of this work should be noted. The data are correlational in nature and statements made regarding causal relations should be interpreted with caution. While these constructs are shown to be related, longitudinal research would show if one actually leads to another. Additionally, this study relied on the use of self report measures and future research may benefit from using alternative methods (e.g., reports from other informed observers, utilizing behavioral observations of the transgressed partner). Regarding the distracter measures, it is not known whether the measures allowed the individuals to discontinue their thoughts about their personality, and focus on the specific transgression. Provided this limitation, it may be the case that some of the individual’s answers may have been primed. The study included university
students from a medium sized Midwestern university; the question arises as to whether the results extend to other populations, such as those of varying cultural backgrounds. Furthermore, because college students were used, the results may not be generalizable to more severe, clinical cases of individuals in the community. Despite these limitations, I hope future studies will extend these results by looking into the effect of other variables. Worthington (1998) found that transgressions can have varying degrees of severity and intensity. It may be that the more hurtful the transgression, the more fearful or depressive the emotional reaction and the stronger the reaction would be toward the transgressor (e.g., seek revenge, avoidance). Therefore, it may be beneficial to investigate the effect of forgiveness more precisely on transgressions of severe nature, for instance, infidelity in partner relationship. Furthermore, research has shown that there are varying types of rumination (e.g., depressive and vengeful rumination; e.g., Berry et al., 2005) and future studies might want to look more closely at how the different facets are related when concerning romantic relationships.

The current study provides further understanding of how attachment is related to one’s mental health. It highlights how attachment styles are associated with the degree to which one shows empathy or worries over the offense, and consequently its influence on one’s decision to forgive within romantic relationships. Furthermore, this study advances our knowledge of how a couple’s relationship and an individual’s well-being can be influenced by not forgiving a transgression that occurred within the relationship.
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APPENDIX A

Transgression-Related Interpersonal Motivations Inventory (TRIM)

Please focus upon some event or series of events in which you feel your current romantic partner did something that significantly hurt you and disrupted your relationship (for example, lied, cheated on you, betrayed a secret). If such an event has happened recently in your current romantic relationship, please choose that event. If not, then you may choose an event that happened in the past.

1. In the space below, please briefly describe the event or series of events that you have chosen.

Please answer the following questions as they apply to your current romantic partner you were describing above. Please answer the following questions using this scale:

Strongly disagree (SD)
I tend to disagree (D)
I’m not sure (NS)
I tend to agree (A)
I strongly agree (SA)
1. I’ll make him/her pay.

2. I am trying to keep as much distance between us as possible.

3. Even though his/her actions hurt me, I have goodwill for him/her.

4. I wish that something bad would happen to him/her.

5. I am living as if he/she doesn’t exist, isn’t around.

6. I want us to bury the hatchet and move forward with our relationship.

7. I don’t trust him/her.

8. Despite what he/she did, I want us to have a positive relationship again.

9. I want him/her to get what he/she deserves.

10. I am finding it difficult to act warmly toward him/her.

11. I am avoiding him/her.

12. Although he/she hurt me, I am putting the hurts aside so we could resume our relationship.
13. I’m going to get even.

14. I forgive him/her for what he/she did to me.

15. I cut off the relationship with him/her.

16. I have released my anger so I can work on restoring our relationship to health.

17. I want to see him/her hurt and miserable.

18. I withdraw from him/her.
APPENDIX B

Intrusiveness Scale of Rumination

Please think about the most recent hurt (i.e. betrayal of trust, infidelity) you have felt within your current romantic relationship that you described in the previous questionnaire and rate the frequency with which you have had each of these experiences within the last 2 weeks.

0 = not at all
1 = very little
2 = somewhat
3 = moderately
4 = considerably
5 = extremely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I couldn’t stop thinking about what he/she did to me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Thoughts and feelings about how he/she hurt me kept running</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strong feelings about what this person did to me kept bubbling up</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Images of the offense kept coming back to me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I brooded about how he/she hurt me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I found it difficult not to think about the hurt that he/she</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I found myself playing the offense over and over in my mind</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Even when I was engaged in other tasks, I thought about how he/she</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Batson’s Eight Item Empathy Scale

Directions: Please indicate below the degree to which you CURRENTLY feel each of these emotions for your current romantic partner.

1. Sympathetic

1 --------------2--------------3--------------4--------------5--------------6
Not at all                        Extremely

2. Empathic

1--------------2--------------3--------------4--------------5---------------6
Not at all                        Extremely

3. Concerned

1 --------------2--------------3--------------4--------------5--------------6
Not at all                         Extremely

4. Moved

1 --------------2--------------3--------------4--------------5--------------6
Not at all                 Extremely

5. Compassionate

1 --------------2--------------3--------------4--------------5--------------6
Not at all                           Extremely

6. Warm

1 --------------2--------------3--------------4--------------5--------------6
Not at all                         Extremely

7. Softhearted

1--------------2--------------3--------------4--------------5--------------6
Not at all                         Extremely

8. Tender

1--------------2--------------3--------------4--------------5--------------6
Not at all                          Extremely
APPENDIX D

Experience in Close Relationships-Revised Scale

The statements below concern how you feel in your relationships with others. We are interested in how you generally experience relationships, not just in what is happening in a current relationship. Respond to each statement by circling a number to indicate how much you agree or disagree with the statement.

1. I'm afraid that I will lose the love of others.

   1 --------------2--------------3--------------4--------------5--------------6--------------7

   Strongly Disagree                Strongly Agree

2. I often worry that others will not want to stay with me.

   1 --------------2--------------3--------------4--------------5--------------6--------------7

   Strongly Disagree                Strongly Agree

3. I often worry that others do not really love me.

   1 --------------2--------------3--------------4--------------5--------------6--------------7

   Strongly Disagree                Strongly Agree

4. I worry that others won’t care about me as much as I care about them.

   1 --------------2--------------3--------------4--------------5--------------6--------------7

   Strongly Disagree                Strongly Agree
5. I often wish that others’ feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for them.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

6. I worry a lot about my relationships.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

7. When my partner is out of sight, I worry that he or she might become interested in someone else.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

8. When I show my feelings for others, I’m afraid they will not feel the same about me.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

9. I rarely worry about others leaving me.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

10. Others make me doubt myself.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree
11. I do not often worry about being abandoned.

1 --------------2--------------3--------------4--------------5--------------6--------------7

Strongly Disagree                Strongly Agree

12. I find that others don't want to get as close as I would like.

1 --------------2--------------3--------------4--------------5--------------6--------------7

Strongly Disagree                Strongly Agree

13. Sometimes others change their feelings about me for no apparent reason.

1 --------------2--------------3--------------4--------------5--------------6--------------7

Strongly Disagree                Strongly Agree

14. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.

1 --------------2--------------3--------------4--------------5--------------6--------------7

Strongly Disagree                Strongly Agree

15. I'm afraid that once someone gets to know me, he or she won't like who I really am.

1 --------------2--------------3--------------4--------------5--------------6--------------7

Strongly Disagree                Strongly Agree

16. It makes me mad that I don't get the affection and support I need from others.

1 --------------2--------------3--------------4--------------5--------------6--------------7

Strongly Disagree                Strongly Agree
17. I worry that I won't measure up to other people.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree                Strongly Agree

18. Others only seem to notice me when I’m angry.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree                Strongly Agree

19. I prefer not to show others how I feel deep down.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree                Strongly Agree

20. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with others.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree                Strongly Agree

21. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on others.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree                Strongly Agree

22. I am very comfortable being close to others.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree                Strongly Agree
23. I don't feel comfortable opening up to others.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |

   Strongly Disagree                  Strongly Agree

24. I prefer not to be too close to romantic others.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |

   Strongly Disagree                  Strongly Agree

25. I get uncomfortable when others want to be very close.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |

   Strongly Disagree                  Strongly Agree

26. I find it relatively easy to get close to others.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |

   Strongly Disagree                  Strongly Agree

27. It's not difficult for me to get close others.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |

   Strongly Disagree                  Strongly Agree

28. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with others.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |
   |  |  |  |  |  |

   Strongly Disagree                  Strongly Agree
29. It helps to turn to others in times of need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. I tell others just about everything.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. I talk things over with others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. I am nervous when others get too close to me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. I feel comfortable depending on others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. I find it easy to depend on others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35. It's easy for me to be affectionate with others.

1 -------------- 2 -------------- 3 -------------- 4 -------------- 5 -------------- 6 -------------- 7

Strongly Disagree                      Strongly Agree

36. Others really understand me and my needs.

1 -------------- 2 -------------- 3 -------------- 4 -------------- 5 -------------- 6 -------------- 7

Strongly Disagree                      Strongly Agree
APPENDIX E

Trait Forgiveness Scale

Directions: Indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement below by using the following scale:

1 = strongly disagree
2 = mildly disagree
3 = agree and disagree equally
4 = mildly agree
5 = strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>People close to me probably think I hold a grudge too long</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I can forgive a friend for almost anything</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>If someone treats me badly, I treat him or her the same</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I try to forgive others even when they don't feel guilty for what they did</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I can usually forgive and forget an insult</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I feel bitter about many of my relationships</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Even after I forgive someone, things often come back to me that I resent</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>There are some things for which I could never forgive even a loved one</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I have always forgiven those who have hurt me</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I am a forgiving person</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

Relationship Assessment Scale

*Please mark the number for each item which best answers that item for you.*

1) How well does your partner meet your needs?

1 2 3 4 5

Poorly Average Extremely Well

2) In general, how satisfied are you with your relationship?

1 2 3 4 5

Unsatisfied Average Extremely Satisfied

3) How good is your relationship compared to most?

1 2 3 4 5

Poor Average Excellent

4) How often do you wish you hadn't gotten into this relationship?

1 2 3 4 5

Never Average Very Often

5) To what extent has your relationship met your original expectations?

1 2 3 4 5

Not at All Average Completely

6) How much do you love your partner?

1 2 3 4 5

Not Much Average Very Much

7) How many problems are there in your relationship?

1 2 3 4 5

Very Few Average Very Many
APPENDIX G

Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression Scale

Circle the number for each statement that best describes how often you felt or behaved this way *DURING THE PAST WEEK*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rarely or none of the time</th>
<th>Some or a little of the time</th>
<th>Occasionally, or a moderate amount of the time</th>
<th>Most or all of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(less than 1 day)</td>
<td>(1-2 days)</td>
<td>(3-4 days)</td>
<td>(5-7 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was bothered by things that usually don’t bother me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not feel like eating: my appetite was poor.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt that I could not shake off the blues even with help from my family or friends</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt that I was just as good as other people.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt depressed.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt that everything I did was an effort</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt hopeful about the future.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I thought my life had been a failure.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt fearful.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My sleep was restless.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was happy.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talked less than usual.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt lonely.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People were unfriendly.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoyed life.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had crying spells.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt sad.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt that people disliked me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could not get “going.”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire

*Each of the items below describes things college students sometimes ask of other people. Please imagine that you are in each situation. You will be asked to answer the following questions:*

1) *How concerned or anxious would you be about how the other person would respond?*

2) *How do you think the other person would be likely to respond?*

1. **You ask someone in class if you can borrow his/her notes.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not the person would want to lend you his/her notes?</th>
<th>very unconcerned</th>
<th>very concerned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would expect that the person would willingly give me his/her notes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I would expect that he/she would want to move in with me.</th>
<th>very unlikely</th>
<th>very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **You ask your boyfriend/girlfriend to move in with you.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not the person would want to move in with you?</th>
<th>very unconcerned</th>
<th>very concerned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **You ask your parents for help in deciding what programs to apply to.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your parents would want to help you?</th>
<th>very unconcerned</th>
<th>very concerned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I would expect that they would want to help me.</th>
<th>very unlikely</th>
<th>very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. You ask someone you don’t know well out on a date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not the person would want to go out with you?</th>
<th>very unconcerned</th>
<th>very concerned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would expect that the person would want to go out with me.</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Your boyfriend/girlfriend has plans to go out with friends tonight, but you really want to spend the evening with him/her, and you tell him/her so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your boyfriend/girlfriend would decide to stay in?</th>
<th>very unconcerned</th>
<th>very concerned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would expect that the person would willingly choose likely to stay in.</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. You ask your parents for extra money to cover living expenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your parents would help you out?</th>
<th>very unconcerned</th>
<th>very concerned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would expect that my parents would not mind helping me out.</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. After class, you tell your professor that you have been having some trouble with a section of the course and ask if he/she can give you some extra help.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your professor would want to help you out?</th>
<th>very unconcerned</th>
<th>very concerned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would expect that my professor would want to help me out.</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. You approach a close friend to talk after doing or saying something that seriously upset him/her.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your friend would want to talk with you?</th>
<th>very unconcerned</th>
<th>very concerned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would expect that he/she would want to talk with me to try to work things out.</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. You ask someone in one of your classes to coffee.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not the person would want to go?

very unconcerned  very concerned
1  2  3  4  5  6

I would expect that the person would want to go with me.

very unlikely  very likely
1  2  3  4  5  6

10. After graduation, you can’t find a job and ask your parents if you can live at home for awhile.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your parents would want you to come home?

very unconcerned  very concerned
1  2  3  4  5  6

I would expect I would be welcome at home.

very unlikely  very likely
1  2  3  4  5  6

11. You ask your friend to go on a vacation with you over Spring Break.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your friend would want to go with you?

very unconcerned  very concerned
1  2  3  4  5  6

I would expect that he/she would want to go with me.

very unlikely  very likely
1  2  3  4  5  6

12. You call your boyfriend/girlfriend after a bitter argument and tell him/her you want to see him/her.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your boyfriend/girlfriend would want to see you?

very unconcerned  very concerned
1  2  3  4  5  6

I would expect that he/she would want to see me.

very unlikely  very likely
1  2  3  4  5  6

13. You ask a friend if you can borrow something of his/hers.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your friend would want to loan it to you?

very unconcerned  very concerned
1  2  3  4  5  6

I would expect that he/she would willingly loan me it.

very unlikely  very likely
1  2  3  4  5  6

14. You ask your parents to come to an occasion important to you.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your parents would want to come?

very unconcerned  very concerned
1  2  3  4  5  6
I would expect that my parents would want to come. very unlikely very likely
1 2 3 4 5 6

15. You ask a friend to do you a big favor.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your friend would do this favor? very unconcerned very concerned
1 2 3 4 5 6

I would expect that he/she would willingly do this favor for me. very unlikely very likely
1 2 3 4 5 6

16. You ask your boyfriend/girlfriend if he/she really loves you.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your boyfriend/girlfriend would say yes? very unconcerned very concerned
1 2 3 4 5 6

I would expect that he/she would answer yes sincerely. very unlikely very likely
1 2 3 4 5 6

17. You go to a party and notice someone on the other side of the room and then you ask them to dance.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not the person would want to dance with you? very unconcerned very concerned
1 2 3 4 5 6

I would expect that he/she would want to dance with me. very unlikely very likely
1 2 3 4 5 6

18. You ask your boyfriend/girlfriend to come home to meet your parents.

How concerned or anxious would you be over whether or not your boyfriend/girlfriend would want to meet your parents? very unconcerned very concerned
1 2 3 4 5 6

I would expect that he/she would want to meet my parents. very unlikely very likely
1 2 3 4 5 6
APPENDIX I

The Silencing the Self Scale

Please circle the number that best describes how you feel about each of the statements listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. I think it is best to put myself first because no one else will look out for me.
   1  2  3  4  5

2. I don't speak my feelings in an intimate relationship when I know they will cause disagreement.
   1  2  3  4  5

3. Caring means putting the other person's needs in front of my own.
   1  2  3  4  5

4. Considering my needs to be as important as those of the people I love is selfish.
   1  2  3  4  5

5. I find it is harder to be myself when I am in a close relationship than when I am on my own.
   1  2  3  4  5

6. I tend to judge myself by how I think other people see me.
   1  2  3  4  5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. I feel dissatisfied with myself because I should be able to do all the things people are supposed to be able to do these days.

1 2 3 4 5

8. When my partner's needs and feelings conflict with my own, I always state mine clearly.

1 2 3 4 5

9. In a close relationship, my responsibility is to make the other person happy.

1 2 3 4 5

10. Caring means choosing to do what the other person wants, even when I want to do something different.

1 2 3 4 5

11. In order to feel good about myself, I need to feel independent and self-sufficient.

1 2 3 4 5

12. One of the worst things I can do is to be selfish.

1 2 3 4 5

13. I feel I have to act in a certain way to please my partner.

1 2 3 4 5
14. Instead of risking confrontations in close relationships, I would rather not rock the boat.
   | Strongly disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Strongly agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

15. I speak my feelings with my partner, even when it leads to problems or disagreements.
   | Strongly disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Strongly agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

16. Often I look happy enough on the outside, but inwardly I feel angry and rebellious.
   | Strongly disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Strongly agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

17. In order for my partner to love me, I cannot reveal certain things about myself to him/her.
   | Strongly disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Strongly agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

18. When my partner's needs or opinions conflict with mine, rather than asserting my own point of view I usually end up agreeing with him/her.
   | Strongly disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Strongly agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

19. When I am in a close relationship I lose my sense of who I am.
   | Strongly disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Strongly agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

20. When it looks as though certain of my needs can't be met in a relationship, I usually realize that they weren't very important anyway.
<p>| Strongly disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Strongly agree |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. My partner loves and appreciates me for who I am.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Doing things just for myself is selfish.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. When I make decisions, other people's thoughts and opinions influence me more than my own thoughts and opinions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I rarely express my anger at those close to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I feel that my partner does not know my real self.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I think it's better to keep my feelings to myself when they do conflict with my partner's.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I often feel responsible for other people's feelings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I find it hard to know what I think and feel because I spend a lot of time thinking about how other people are feeling.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29. In a close relationship I don't usually care what we do, as long as the other person is happy.
   1  2  3  4  5

30. I try to bury my feelings when I think they will cause trouble in my close relationship(s).
   1  2  3  4  5

*31. I never seem to measure up to the standards I set for myself.
   1  2  3  4  5

* If you answered the last question with a 4 or 5, please list up to three standards you feel you don't measure up to.

1.

2.

3.
APPENDIX J

State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory – State Scale

**Instructions**: Everybody gets angry from time to time. A number of statements that people have used to describe the times that they get angry are included below. Read each statement and circle the number to the right of the statement that best describes you. There are no right or wrong answers. Please answer every item.

If the statement is completely undescriptive of you, circle a 1.
If the statement is mostly undescriptive of you, circle a 2.
If the statement is partly undescriptive and partly descriptive of you, circle a 3.
If the statement is mostly descriptive of you, circle a 4.
If the statement is completely descriptive of you, circle a 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Completely Undescriptive</th>
<th>Completely Descriptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I tend to get angry more frequently than most people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other people seem to get angrier than I do in similar circumstances.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I harbor grudges that I don't tell anyone about.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I try to get even when I'm angry with someone.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I am secretly quite critical of others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>It is easy to make me angry.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>When I am angry with someone, I let that person know.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I have met many people who are supposed to be experts who are no better than I.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Something makes me angry almost every day.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I often feel angrier than I think I should.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I feel guilty about expressing my anger.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>When I am angry with someone, I take it out on whoever is around.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Some of my friends have habits that annoy and bother me very much.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I am surprised at how often I feel angry.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Once I let people know I'm angry, I can put it out of my mind.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>People talk about me behind my back.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>At times, I feel angry for no specific reason.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I can make myself angry about something in the past just by thinking about it.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Even after I have expressed my anger, I have trouble forgetting about it.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>When I hide my anger from others, I think about it for a long time.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>People can bother me just by being around.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>When I get angry, I stay angry for hours.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>When I hide my anger from others, I forget about it pretty quickly.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I try to talk over problems with people without letting them know I'm angry.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>When I get angry, I calm down faster than most people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I get so angry, I feel like I might lose control.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>If I let people see the way I feel, I'd be considered a hard person to get along with.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I am on my guard with people who are friendlier than I expected.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. It's difficult for me to let people know I'm angry.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I get angry when someone lets me down.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I get angry when people are unfair.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I get angry when something blocks my plans.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I get angry when I am delayed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I get angry when someone embarrasses me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I get angry when I have to take orders from someone less capable than I.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I get angry when I have to work with incompetent people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I get angry when I do something stupid.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I get angry when I am not given credit for something I have done.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K

Demographics/Background Questionnaire

Please complete the following questionnaire by checking or circling the appropriate number. All of your responses will remain confidential. Please do not place your name on this questionnaire.

1. Gender: Male ____  Female ____

2. Age: ____

4. Race:
   1. ____ Caucasian (White)   2. ____ Asian or Pacific Islander
   3. ____ African American   4. ____ Latino/a
   5. ____ American Indian   6. ____ Other (Specify)

5. How long have you been with your romantic partner?

   Years ____          Months ____

6. What is the nature of your current romantic relationship?

   1. Friends with Benefits
   2. Dating (open relationship)
   3. Dating (exclusively)
   4. Engaged (not living together)
   5. Engaged (living together)
   6. Married
APPENDIX L

Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Project

Project Title: Forgiveness in a Romantic Relationship

Investigator(s): Kate Hibbard and Lee J. Dixon, Ph.D. (Faculty Advisor)

Description of Study: Participants will complete a series of self-report questionnaires addressing romantic attachment, relationships, forgiveness, anger, and mental health.

Adverse Effects and Risks: No adverse effects are anticipated. However, you will be asked to think about your current romantic partner who has wronged you in the past, which may possibly raise negative emotions. In addition, you will be asked to reflect on feelings regarding how you relate to others, you will also be asked to reflect on your feelings of anger, depression, your satisfaction in the relationship, and how often you think about the negative event that occurred within your relationship. If at any time while completing the questionnaires you begin to feel uncomfortable, please discontinue your participation, knowing that doing so will not affect your receiving credit for participating. Students who are experiencing distress are further encouraged to schedule an appointment at the university counseling center at 937.229.3141. There is no charge for counseling services to undergraduates at U.D.

Duration of Study: The study consists of one session that will take approximately 40 minutes.

Confidentiality of Data: You will not be asked to place your name on any of the questionnaires, and your responses will be identified with a research code.

Contact Person: If you have questions or problems regarding the study, you can contact Kate Hibbard at (360.808.0963) hibbarkc@notes.udayton.edu, the faculty advisor, Lee J. Dixon, Ph.D. at (937.229.2160) lee.dixon@notes.udayton.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact the chair of the Research Review and Ethics Committee, Greg C. Elvers at (937.229.2171) greg.elvers@notes.udayton.edu
Consent to Participate: I have voluntarily decided to participate in this study. The investigator named above has adequately answered any and all questions I have about this study, the procedures involved, and my participation. I understand that the investigator named above will be available to answer any questions about research procedures throughout this study. I also understand that I may voluntarily terminate my participation in this study at any time and still receive full credit. I also understand that the investigator named above may terminate my participation in this study if s/he feels this to be in my best interest. In addition, I certify that I am 18 (eighteen) years of age or older.

___________________________             _________________________
Signature of Student                                   Student’s Name (printed)     Date

___________________________
Signature of Witness

Research Review and Ethics Committee
APPENDIX M

Debriefing Form

Information about the Study

Intimate relationships are among the most important and enduring interpersonal relationships; however, it is inevitable that people will experience difficulties at some point during the relationship. Relationship partners use several tools to work through these problems and forgiveness is one tool used in coping with the hurt feelings (Enright & Fitzgibbons, 2000; McCullough, 2001). Forgiveness has been shown to be related to several constructs, including attachment style (the way you relate to others in the context of intimate relationships), empathy, rumination (constantly thinking about a certain event/individual), one’s satisfaction in a romantic relationship, and a person’s well being. In order to measure attachment style we looked at factors such as how much one avoids their partner or how much they worry about their romantic relationship. In order to assess for empathy we asked questions regarding feelings you may have toward your partner (e.g., warmth or sympathy) after the offense was committed. Additionally, we measured your tendency to think about your reported transgression by asking questions such as “Images of the event kept coming back to me.” Your satisfaction in the relationship was measured by asking eight questions regarding how happy you are with your relationship. Lastly, your well-being was assessed by asking questions such as “I did not feel like eating; my appetite was poor.”

Each of these measures allowed us to test our hypotheses. For example, evidence has shown that avoidant attachment (lacking intimacy and closeness toward their partner) is linked with reduced empathy, which is, in turn, associated with reduced forgiveness (Burnet et al., 2009). Given this link, we expect that a person who has an avoidant attachment style will experience reduced empathy for their partner, which, in turn, will make them less likely to forgive their romantic partner. Similarly, when a person is ruminating about how his or her partner hurt them it can lead to a person wanting to avoid contact with his or her partner and even seek revenge against his or her partner. Research has found that those who have an anxious attachment style (lacking a sense of security in the relationship) tend to think more about the transgression, which, in turn, may lead to a less likelihood of forgiveness (Burnette et al., 2009). We expect that a person who has an anxious attachment will be more likely to ruminate about the transgression, which, in turn, will be associated with reduced forgiveness.

Forgiveness has also been linked to depression and one’s satisfaction in a romantic relationship. Dixon, Gordon, & Hughes (under review) found that forgiveness of one’s partner is associated with an increase in marital satisfaction, which leads to reduced levels of depression. Although Dixon et al. (under review) found this particular link, their findings may be due to the fact that the victim may just have a forgiving personality. We argue that despite this forgiving personality, it may be that even above and beyond these engrained traits, not forgiving a specific transgression may lead to lower satisfaction in one’s relationship with one’s partner, which in turn may lead to higher levels of depression.
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Assurance of Privacy

Your responses will be confidential and they will only be identified by a participant number in the data along with other participant’s numbers.

Contact Information

If you have questions or problems regarding the study, you can contact Kate Hibbard at (360.808.0963) hibbarkc@notes.udayton.edu or the faculty advisor, Lee J. Dixon, Ph.D. at (937.229.2160) Lee.Dixon@notes.udayton.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact the chair of the Research Review and Ethics Committee, Greg C. Elvers, Ph.D. at (937.229.2171) greg.elvers@notes.udayton.edu.

Some items from the surveys you completed measured levels of depression (e.g., “I felt that I could not shake off the blues even with help from my family or friends”) and anger (e.g., “Something makes me angry almost every day”). Individuals who endorse these items (or similar items) many times during the last week may benefit from receiving counseling. In addition, if you endorsed items related to you having a difficult time not thinking about the betrayal that you wrote about (e.g., “Even when I was engaged in other tasks, I thought about how he/she hurt me”) or if you have noticed that you are feeling overly bitter toward the person who betrayed you (e.g., “I wish that something bad would happen to him/her”), you may benefit from counseling. Lastly, there were many questions that you answered that deal with how you relate to others in close relationships (e.g., “I’m afraid that once someone gets to know me, he or she won’t like who I really am” and “I find it is harder to be myself when I am in a close relationship than when I am on my own”). Along these lines, there were items that you answered that are related to your feeling sensitive to others rejecting you (e.g., you feel very concerned that your parents would not come to an occasion that is important to you). If you feel that you have more difficulties in your close relationships than you are comfortable with, counseling may be able to help you with this. You can schedule an appointment at the university counseling center at 937.229.3141. Counseling services are free for U.D. undergraduates. If you should call after the Counseling Center is closed, the answering service will have the on call counselor return your call.

Thanks and Credit

Thank you for your participation in this study. I will award you one research credit for your participation.