

Supplemental Materials

for

When Forgiveness Signals Power: Effects of Forgiveness Expression and Forgiver Gender

Table of Content

- Experimental Materials
 - Pilot Study
 - Study 1
 - Study 2
- Supplemental Analyses of Study 2

Pilot Study

- **Instruction:** Conflict is common in our daily life. After getting hurt, people may try to communicate with the offender to put an end to the conflict. Please read the following examples and answer their corresponding questions.
- Manipulation [Within-participants design, presented in a random order]
[*Unforgiveness condition*]
After having conflict with B, A said to B, "I do not forgive you for what you have done to me."
[*Explicit forgiveness condition*]
After having conflict with B, A said to B, "I forgive you for what you have done to me."
[*Implicit forgiveness condition*]
After having conflict with B, A said to B, "It's OK for what you have done to me."
- Please answer the following questions based on what A said (1 = *Not at all*, 7 = *Very much*).
 1. A felt hurt by B.
 2. A thought B should be responsible for the conflict.
 3. A has released his/her anger towards B.
 4. A wanted to restore a positive relationship with B.
 5. A has forgiven B.
- Fill in demographics (i.e. age, gender, etc.)

Study 1

Scenario

- **Instruction:** You will read a scenario about a workplace conflict. Please take the role of a coworker of people in the scenario, and answer the questions below.
- Conflict Scenario and Manipulations

You are a coworker with Chris and [Mark/Mary] at the marketing department of a large candy company. For the past several weeks, Chris and [Mark/Mary] have been developing an integrated advertising package for a new candy. They agreed to divide their work and roles, and to both contribute in generating a proposal. In the end, they would present the proposal to the VP as a whole team.

As the deadline was getting close, Chris claimed to have a horrible case of back pain and had to spend two to three weeks in bed. Chris asked [Mark/Mary] to finish off the proposal, but promised to present it together with [Mark/Mary]. There was still a substantial amount of work to do. To meet the proposal deadline, [Mark/Mary] had been working until late into the night when Chris was on leave. The proposal turned out to be highly evaluated by the VP, and the VP gave bonuses to both Chris and [Mark/Mary]. However, [Mark/Mary] was then told by a colleague that Chris was tagged on Facebook with a group of friends traveling in Europe during the “sick leave”.

Two days later, you overheard [Mark/Mary] and Chris’ conversation down the hallway. [Mark/Mary] started a conversation with Chris about the incident. During the conversation, [Mark/Mary] said,

[Explicit forgiveness condition]

“Chris, I forgive you. Let’s move on.”

[Implicit forgiveness condition]

“Chris, it’s not a big deal. Let’s move on.”

Measures

- Perception of forgiver power (adapted from Anderson & Galinsky's (2016) sense of power scale)

Please answer the following questions based on what you have read about [Mark/Mary].

I think in [Mark's/Mary's] relationship with others, ... (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*)

1. [Mark/Mary] can get people listen to what [he/she] says.
2. [Mark's/Mary's] wishes do not carry much weight. (R)
3. [Mark/Mary] can get others to do what [he/she] wants.
4. Even if [Mark/Mary] voices them, [his/her] views have little sway. (R)
5. [Mark/Mary] has a great deal of power.
6. [Mark's/Mary's] ideas and opinions are often ignored. (R)
7. Even when [Mark/Mary] tries, [he/she] is not able to get [his/her] way. (R)
8. If [Mark/Mary] wants to, [he/she] gets to make the decisions.

- Questions of cooperation

Imagine that you are a coworker with Chris and [Mark/Mary]. How would you respond to [Mark/Mary] in the following situations?

Situation 1. [Mark/Mary] has an urgent deadline on another project, and needs a helping hand.

- (1) How willing are you to help [Mark/Mary]? (1 = *Not at all*, 7 = *Very much*)
- (2) How many overtime hours do you wish to spend in helping [Mark/Mary]? (1 – 7)

Situation 2. [Mark/Mary] is looking for teammates for a new project.

- (1) How willing are you in joining [Mark's/Mary's] team? (1 = *Not at all*, 7 = *Very much*)
- (2) How cooperative would you be with [Mark/Mary] if you two work in the same team? (1 = *Not at all*, 7 = *Very much*)

Situation 3. [Mark/Mary] has been going through a family crisis. How willing are you

to offer informal support to [Mark/Mary]? (1 = *Not at all*, 7 = *Very much*)

Situation 4. [Mark/Mary] has been sick and has to stay at home. How willing are you to visit [Mark/Mary]? (1 = *Not at all*, 7 = *Very much*)

➤ Manipulation checks

Please recall details in the conflict scenario and respond to the following questions. (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*)

1. [Mark/Mary] explicitly told Chris, “I forgive you”.
2. [Mark/Mary] downplayed the incident by saying “It’s no big deal”.

➤ Fill in demographics (i.e. age, gender, ethnicity, etc.)

Study 2

Procedure

➤ Instruction:

In this task, you will play an interactive game with two other participants, who have logged on to the study at the same time as you. During the game, you and the other players will only be connected through our system. Participants' identities will be kept anonymous, except that each of you will be referred to by your nickname. Bonus will be given based on the final outcome. After completing the whole experiment, players who get the highest number of points in the game will have a chance to enter into a lottery for a prize of \$10 USD.

The system is connecting you with two other participants.... The game will start once the other two participants are connected.

[Manipulation of forgiver gender]

The system has successfully connected you with two other participants with whom you will be playing the game.

The players are:

Player 1: Chris

Player 2: [Mark/Mary]

Player 3: [the participant's nickname]

There will be 6 rounds of interaction. In each round, two of you will be randomly selected to play the game, while the third person will be the observer.

Game Instruction: In each round, the two players will be randomly selected to play the game. They can choose either to cooperate or to compete. The combination of the two players' choices jointly determines how many points each of them would get in each round. The goal is to earn as many points as possible. The more points you receive, the better for

you. Likewise, the more points the other player receives, the better for him/her (see the payoff schedule).

		Your choice	
		To cooperate	To compete
The other's choice	To cooperate	You get: +1 The other gets: +1	You get: +2 The other gets: -2
	To compete	You get: -2 The other gets: +2	You get: -1 The other gets: -1

Note: Payoffs were triple in Rounds 4 to 6.

Game Instruction: There is other important information that you should know before the game starts.

1. The game consists of 6 rounds.
2. In each round, two of you will be randomly selected to play the game. That is, each player will play 4 times in total.
3. While two participants are playing the game, the remaining participant will be the observer. In each round, the observer should carefully watch the interaction between the two players and answer some questions based on the observation.
4. Before the first round, all three players can get to know each other by exchanging a message.
5. After each round, the two players who have played the game can provide a piece of comment to the others about that particular round.

Before Round 1 began, each player could exchange a message as a self-introduction. Chris said to all, “Hi, this is Chris. I will choose to cooperate”. Chris and [Mark/Mary] were then “chosen” to play in Round 1. [Mark/Mary] chose to cooperate, but Chris broke the promise and chose to defect.

[Manipulation of forgiveness expression]

After the result of Round 1 was announced, the two players could exchange

comments as feedback to each other. [Mark/Mary] sent a message to Chris to express forgiveness.

[Explicit forgiveness condition]

“Chris, I forgive you. Let’s move on.”

[Implicit forgiveness condition]

“Chris, it’s not a big deal. Let’s move on.”

In the post-survey of Round 1, participants, who were assigned as observers in this round, reported their perceptions of forgiver power.

Participants then played with [Mark/Mary] in Rounds 2 and 5, and played with Chris in Rounds 3 and 4. [Mark/Mary] played with Chris again in Round 6. [Mark/Mary] was programmed to always cooperate, while Chris was programmed to always defect. At the end of Round 6, participants responded to the manipulation checks, reported their demographics, and guessed the research purpose.

Measures

- Perceptions of the forgiver and the offender (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*)

Based on your observation in Round 1, what do you think of [Mark/Mary]?

1. Weak (R)
2. Powerful
3. Assertive
4. Moral
5. Virtuous
6. Righteous

Based on your observation in Round 1, what do you think of Chris?

1. Weak (R)
2. Powerful
3. Assertive

- 4. Moral
- 5. Virtuous
- 6. Righteous

➤ Cooperation: indicated by the sum of participants' points in Rounds 2 and 5.

➤ Manipulation checks

Please recall details in the game and respond to the following questions. (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*)

1. [Mark/Mary] explicitly told Chris, "I forgive you".
2. [Mark/Mary] downplayed the incident by saying "It's no big deal".
3. [Mark/Mary] has forgiven Chris.

➤ Fill in demographics (i.e. age, gender, ethnicity, etc.)

➤ What do you think was the purpose of the study?

Supplemental Analyses of Study 2

- Descriptives of perceptions of forgiver and offender

		Mean (<i>SD</i>)	Correlation		
			1	2	3
1	Perceived forgiver power	4.21 (1.06)			
2	Perceived forgiver morality	5.28 (1.05)	.22**		
3	Perceived offender power	4.61 (1.22)	-.21**	-.01	
4	Perceived offender morality	3.04 (1.45)	-.02	-.35**	.45**

- Results of ANCOVAs on perceptions of forgiver and offender

We performed 2 (forgiveness expression: explicit vs. implicit) X 2 (forgiver gender: male vs. female) ANCOVAs on perceived forgiver morality, perceived offender power, and perceived offender morality by controlling for perceived genuine forgiveness. The main effects of forgiveness expression, the main effects of forgiver gender, as well as their interaction effects were not significant, $F(1, 148) \leq 3.19, p \geq .076, \eta_p^2 \leq .021$. Thus, the Forgiveness Expression X Forgiver Gender interaction did not predict perceived forgiver morality, perceived offender power, or perceived offender morality, after controlling for perceived genuine forgiveness.