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Emotional intelligence as a predictor to organizational forgiveness and reconciliation

Leung Sui Yiu Cathy
The University of Hong Kong
Abstract

This study investigated the impacts of emotional intelligence on forgiveness as well as reconciliation in organizations. Participants completed questionnaires with scenarios that either an absence or presence of repeated offense was encountered. Results supported that victims with higher emotional intelligence were more willing to forgive and to reconcile with offenders. Significant results also confirmed that trait forgivingness acted as a mediator between emotional intelligence and forgiveness as well as reconciliation. Besides, this study revealed that people with higher level of emotional intelligence and trait forgivingness tended to forgive and to reconcile regardless of the number of offenses they had encountered. Implication of the importance of emotional intelligence on organizational forgiveness was discussed, and future research directions were suggested.
Introduction

Conflicts at work and offenses among coworkers happen in organizational settings nearly everywhere, every day. People tended to respond to offenses with negative behaviors, such as avoiding contact with the offender or seeking revenge (McCullough, 2001), which may worsen the already breaking relationship. Damaged relationships among coworkers after offenses in turn affect the normal operations and productivity of an organization. Recently, organizational forgiveness is becoming one of the most popular research topics studied by management researchers and applied psychologists (Kelley & Waldron, 2006). A growing body of research suggested that forgiveness in organizational settings facilitated healthy interpersonal relationship particularly at times of offenses in the workplace (Aquino, Grover, Goldman, & Folger, 2003; Struthers, Dupuis, & Eaton, 2005).

Forgiveness and reconciliation after offenses were suggested to have improved organizational harmony through fostering cooperation among workers, and enhanced productivity with unnecessary expenses avoided (Cameron, Bright, & Caza, 2004). When forgiveness took place that negative feelings or emotions were replaced by positive or at least neutral ones (Worthington, 2003), relationship between the victim and the offender could be restored as the former let go the negative feelings toward the latter. According to Fitzgibbons (1986), coworkers’ relationship might be restored by reducing negative feelings toward each other through forgiveness after an offense was experienced. Walters (1984) suggested that emotional consequences of being hurt after an offense would be reduced when the victim let go all negative feelings to the offender, which in turn promoted relationship restoration. As the relationships among coworkers were restored after offenses, cooperation among coworkers would be facilitated, and thus organizational functioning would be enhanced. In view of these
previous studies, emotional regulations seemed to be an essential component in forgiveness in offensive situations that help to enhance organizational harmony through relationship restoration or improvement. On the other hand, forgiveness was assumed to be related to, yet different from reconciliation (Mullet, Girard, & Bakhshi, 2004). Reconciliation was an act of goodwill by the offended individual toward the offender, hoping to restore their relationship after an offense (McCullough et al., 1998). Shnabel and Nadler (2008) suggested that reconciliation could be facilitated when the emotional needs of both the victims and offenders were satisfied through post-conflict interactions. Although forgiveness and reconciliation were not synonymous, they were both involved in relationship restoration through emotional change.

Nevertheless, people differ from one another in terms of the ability to recognize, regulate and express their own emotions as well as to understand and to interpret others’ emotions. This ability of emotion expressions and interpretations was termed emotional intelligence (Mayer and Salovey, 1997). As a link between forgiveness and emotional regulations appeared to have emerged, it seems reasonable to emphasize on the investigation of emotional intelligence that might be related to organizational forgiveness, which helped to resolve interpersonal conflicts in workplaces. Emotional intelligence was studied as a set of human cognitive and intellectual abilities related to emotions beyond academic intelligence (Zeidner, Matthews, & Roberts, 2004). Despite various researchers implied the importance of emotions in intellectual functioning through social intelligence studies, the term emotional intelligence (EI) was not introduced until the early 90’s by Mayer, Di Paolo, and Salovey (1990). A model of EI was later developed by Mayer and Salovey (1997) to explain the individual differences of the abilities regarding emotions. Personal relationship satisfaction and work success were reported to have achieved when people processed emotional information accurately and efficiently (Salovey & Grewal,
As a result, numerous researchers had grown interest in EI in the workplace to look for potential solutions for work-related problems and performance enhancement (Cartwright & Pappas, 2007). However, no research up to date had yet investigated the relationship among EI, forgiveness, and reconciliation upon offenses in organizations. In view of this shortfall among the flourishing studies of organizational forgiveness, this study will try to explore the relationship among EI, forgiveness, and reconciliation at times of offenses in the workplace.

In view of individual differences, does dispositional characteristic play a part in EI? McCullough (2001) suggested that forgiveness propensity was a dispositional personality characteristic because disposition to forgive was found to be related to agreeableness (i.e., more empathic and generous toward others) and emotional stability (i.e., less likely to experience negative emotions) (Walker & Gorsuch, 2002). The disposition to forgive interpersonal transgressions across situations over time was discovered to have fostered physical and psychological well-being through overcoming negative traits and affects (Berry, Worthington, Parrott, O’Conner & Wade, 2001). Berry et al. (2001) reported that dispositional forgiveness was related to affects, in which higher level of dispositional forgiveness was related to positive and pro-social emotions such as agreeableness while lower level of dispositional forgiveness was related to negative emotions such as neuroticism (i.e., the opposite of emotional stability).

Dispositional forgiveness was named trait forgivingness by Roberts (1995) in order to distinguish the disposition level among individuals’ forgiving behavior. The term “trait forgivingness” was utilized by various researchers, and was interpreted as a personality trait to explain individuals’ acts in interpersonal relationships (Berry et al., 2001). In addition, researchers started to recognize the importance for research on trait forgivingness in relation to forgiveness (Berry et al., 2001). Thompson et al. (2005) suggested that forgivingness should be
viewed in multi-dimensions: forgiveness of self, forgiveness of others, and forgiveness of situations beyond one’s control. The multidimensional conception of trait forgivingness certainly captured most of the important factors that were related to forgiveness, which should be considered as the basic construction of the trait as well as the tendency to forgive. People who possessed a higher level of trait forgivingness were able to forgive themselves, transgressors, and situations more readily through the process of replacing negative thoughts, behaviors and affects by more positive and conciliatory ones (Enright & Fitzgibbons, 2000; McCullough, Fincham, & Tsang, 2003; Thompson et al., 2005), while the ability to regulate and control emotions stressed in EI, Davies, Stankov, and Roberts (1998) suggested that negative affects or thoughts may switch to positive ones to overcome distress. In this sense, EI seemed to have mirrored the effect of trait forgivingness, and a link between emotional intelligence and trait forgivingness seemed to have emerged. Yet, only a minority of research explored whether forgiveness tendency would be enhanced with emotional elements (McCullough, 2001), while no research had investigated the relationship between emotional intelligence and forgiveness thus far. Therefore, this study will shed light on the relationship between the two constructs.

Construct definitions

Emotional Intelligence (EI)

Social scientists and psychologists hinted that emotions were an important aspect in cognitive functioning, and emotional intelligence was viewed as human intellectual abilities related to emotion beyond academic intelligence (Zeidner et al., 2004). Mayer et al. (1990) defined EI as the ability of an individual to deal with his own emotions. Nonetheless, Salovey and Mayer (1990) considered EI as a social intelligence that included one’s ability to monitor his own as well as the others’ emotions and feelings, to set them apart, and to use this information to
direct one’s thoughts and behaviors. Davies et al. (1998) later described EI as an individual’s ability to deal with emotions, which should include four dimensions: (1) emotion appraisal and expression of the self in which an individual is able to understand and express his emotions naturally, (2) emotion appraisal and recognition of others that an individual is able to perceive and understand others’ emotion correctly, (3) emotion regulation of the self that an individual is able to regulate his emotion to overcome distress quickly, and (4) the use of emotion in facilitating performance that an individual is able to direct his emotions to constructive performance. However, Mayer, Caruso, and Salovey (2000) developed the Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale with another definition which was slightly different from that defined by Davies et al. (1998), again, with four dimensions: (1) the ability to express emotion with accurate emotion perception and appraisal, (2) the ability to access and/or produce feelings once thoughts were facilitated, (3) the ability to comprehend emotion as well as emotional knowledge, and (4) the ability to manage emotions so as to foster emotional and intellectual growth. Despite these minor differences, a consensus that EI should be an ability to process emotional information seemed to have derived (Davies et al., 1998; Mayer, Caruso, and Salovey, 1999).

However, in view of the conceptualization of EI, there seemed to be a lack of empirically validated EI measurement, especially for practical utility framed in Asia context (Wong, Law, & Wong, 2004). In view of the limitation, Wong et al. (2004) developed a measure of EI particularly for Chinese respondents in Hong Kong with a revised conceptualization of EI based on the consolidation of the EI dimensions captured by Davies et al. (1998) and Mayer et al. (2000): (1) appraisal and expression of self emotion, which was related to the ability to comprehend one’s own deep emotions and to be able to naturally express them, (2) appraisal and
recognition of others’ emotion, which was related to the ability to perceive and to understand others’ emotions, (3) regulation of self emotion, which was related to the ability to regulate one’s emotions so that one could be recovered from emotional climax and distress more readily and rapidly, and (4) use of emotion in facilitating constructive performance, which was related to the ability to make use of one’s emotions by guiding them toward constructive performance and activities. In the present study, the definition of EI would be based on this conceptualization by Wong et al. (2004) since a consolidation of other researchers’ conceptualization on EI had been substantially incorporated and addressed.

**Trait Forgivingness**

Roberts (1995) coined dispositional forgiveness as “trait forgivingness” in order to distinguish the disposition level among individuals’ forgiving behavior. As discussed above, trait forgivingness was the disposition to forgive interpersonal transgressions across situations over time (Berry et al., 2001), which was interpreted as a personality trait to explain individual differences in encountering interpersonal relationships. Berry et al. (2001) developed a measurement on trait forgivingness, Transgression Narrative Test of Forgivingness (TNTF), based on this definition. However, the TNTF alone was not sufficient in measuring the broad scope of the dispositional level of forgiveness as other potential variables affecting the disposition to forgive were not addressed in the development of TNTF, such as some cognitive and affective trait variables (e.g. hostility and guilt). Prior to the development of TNTF, there was only one measure that was purported to investigate forgivingness (Mauger, et al., 1992; as cited in Berry et al., 2001). In addition, previous studies revealed that trait forgivingness was mostly measured in terms of individuals’ tendency to forgive others (Thompson et al., 2005). In view of the limitation of the measurement in trait forgivingness, Thompson et al. (2005)
suggested that the dispositional level of granting forgiveness should be viewed in multi-dimensions instead of only focusing on the forgiveness of others, and thus developed the Heartland Forgiveness Scale (HFS) to measure trait forgivingness with three subscales to measure forgiveness toward the self, the others, as well as the situations beyond one’s control. All the three forgiveness components were reported to be related to healthy relationships (Thompson et al., 2005). In this study, the concept of trait forgivingness would be based on the definition suggested by Thompson et al. (2005), but only the components of forgiveness of the others and of situations would be used as they seemed to be more related to the context of forgiveness as defined below (i.e. interpersonal forgiveness in organizational situation).

Forgiveness

Interpersonal forgiveness had been studied in different areas including social, cognitive, developmental, and clinical aspects, while different definitions of forgiveness appeared in different literatures. (Mullet et al., 2004; Kearns & Fincham, 2004). Nevertheless, most of the studies tended to focus on either the cognitive or affective components happened in the offended persons’ mind after an offense. Various research suggested the conceptualization of forgiveness by laypeople seemed to be different from one another (Mullet et al., 2004). However, Kearns and Fincham (2004) proposed that layperson conceptualized forgiveness in a similar manner to that of forgiveness researchers in terms of being less motivated to avoid the offender and to seek revenge (McCullough et al., 1998). In addition, forgiveness was portrayed as a facilitator of relationship repair and maintenance where affective transformation played an essential role (Denham, Neal, Wilson, Pickering, Boyatzis, 2005). Previous studies defined forgiveness in terms of “emotional” and “decisional”. “Emotional forgiveness” took place when negative emotions were replaced by positive ones, while “decisional forgiveness” involved a change in a
person’s behavioral intentions toward a transgressor (Exline, Worthington, Hill & McCullough, 2003; Worthington, 2003; Worthington & Wade, 1999; Worthington & Scherer, 2004; Wade & Worthington, 2003). Nevertheless, other studies added that forgiveness was a process to replace negative thoughts, behaviors and affects with more positive and conciliatory ones (Enright & Fitzgibbons, 2000; McCullough et al., 2003). Although both cognitive and emotional aspects were considered to be important determinants of forgiveness, empathy, a factor largely depended on affect and emotion, was found to be one of the most proximal determinants of the capacity to forgive others (McCullough et al., 1998). Since forgiveness stressed heavily on the emotional change by the individual being offended, the concept of forgiveness in this study would be based on the conception of emotional forgiveness.

Beside interpersonal forgiveness, forgiveness was also studied with different situations or contexts, such as forgiveness in romantic relationships, family relationships, and organizational relationships. In organizational settings, forgiveness was considered to have facilitated healthy relationships in offenses, which promoted relationship restorations among coworkers. (Aquino et al., 2003; Struthers et al., 2005) Forgiveness could be a business strategy in the way that it could potentially restore damaged relationship in organizational settings, so that organizational harmony could be improved and staff performance and productivities could be enhanced to achieve organizational desired outcome (Cameron et al., 2004; Kurzynski 1998). In addition, organizational citizenship could also be formed through the enhancement of organizational harmony (Bolino, Turnley, & Bloodgood, 2002). As forgiveness was widely accepted as an intrapersonal and pro-social change by being less motivated to avoid the offender and to seek revenge after an offense in interpersonal contexts, McCullough et al. (1998) developed the Transgression-Related Interpersonal Motivation Inventory -12 Items Form (TRIM-12) to
measure forgiveness in terms of offender avoidance and revenge seeking. Since the conceptualization of forgiveness suggested by McCullough et al. (1998) could also be true in organizational settings that forgiveness facilitated relationship restoration and coworker cooperation after an offense, this definition of forgiveness will also be adopted in this study.

Reconciliation

Reconciliation was the victim’s effort to treat the offender with goodwill, hoping to restore and maintain their relationship (McCullough et al. 1998). According to Shnabel and Nadler (2008), reconciliation could be facilitated when the emotional needs of both the victims and offenders were met properly through post-conflict interactions. For example, apology from an offender might satisfy the victim’s emotional need by relieving his or her anger. In addition, researchers acknowledged that forgiveness and reconciliation were distinct concepts although they both seemed to be related to relationship restoration through emotional alteration (Zechmeister & Romero, 2002). Reconciliation was proposed to be a consequence of forgiveness instead of part of it (Denham et al, 2005). To differentiate between forgiveness and reconciliation, Baumeister, Exline, and Sommer (1999) described that forgiveness was an “intrapsychic state” that was not accompanied by reconciliation, which was in fact an interpersonal act. According to Aquino et al. (2003), a victim could overcome negative emotions, forgive, forget and move on without a desire to restore a relationship with the offender. On the other hand, the victim might try to reconcile when maintaining a relationship was thought to be beneficial, even when he or she was still in deep anger or resentment. In view of these previous studies, reconciliation is defined to be an act to relationship restoration, which was a different concept from forgiveness in this study.

Research Objectives and Hypotheses
As mentioned above, forgiveness and reconciliation was largely related to emotional entities. An individual’s motive to forgive and to reconcile after an offense seemed to be depended on his or her emotions (Fitzgibbons, 1986; Worthington, 2003). As a dispositional characteristic, trait forgivingness was posited to have fostered the motive to forgive over time across situations (Berry et al., 2001). In view of these relationships, the following objectives are developed for the present study.

**Objective 1: Investigate the positive relationship between forgiveness and reconciliation**

Although forgiveness and reconciliation are not identical concepts, they have been reported to be related to each other from previous research. In addition, Denham et al., (2005) suggested that reconciliation was a consequence of forgiveness. Therefore, it is reasonable to test out the relationship between forgiveness and reconciliation before taking a step further to study the relationship between trait forgivingness and reconciliation.

**Hypothesis 1: Prediction effect of organizational forgiveness on reconciliation**

Victims’ tendency to forgive may affect their reconciliation tendencies. It is expected that organizational forgiveness would account for the variance change in reconciliation.

**Objective 2: Investigate the prediction effect of trait forgivingness on organizational forgiveness and reconciliation**

Trait forgivingness was the disposition to forgive interpersonal transgressions across situations over time (Berry et al., 2001), which was thus expected to be a predictor of interpersonal forgiveness across situations. When the level of trait forgivingness is high, the level of the tendency to forgive will also be high. Therefore, it is justifiable to predict that victims with higher level of trait forgivingness will also have a higher level of forgiveness tendency after an offense in an organizational setting regardless of the number of offenses experienced. In addition,
people who possessed a higher level of trait forgivingness were able to forgive transgressor more readily through the process of replacing negative behaviors by more positive and conciliatory ones (Enright & Fitzgibbons, 2000; McCullough et al., 2003). Thus, it is also reasonable to predict that victims with a higher level of trait forgivingness tend to be more willing to reconcile with the offender. To assess these relationships, four hypotheses are derived:

**Hypothesis 2a: Prediction effect of trait forgivingness on organizational forgiveness**

Victims’ level of trait forgivingness may reflect their tendency to forgive after an offense in an organizational setting. It is expected that trait forgivingness would account for the variance change in organizational forgiveness.

**Hypothesis 2b: Prediction effect of trait forgivingness on organizational forgiveness regardless of the number of offenses**

As trait forgivingness was portrayed as the disposition to forgive regardless of the situation and time, it is expected that the interaction between trait forgivingness and the absence or presence of repeated offenses will not significantly affect the level of organizational forgiveness, in which the presence or absence of repeated offenses would not account for the variance change in the relationship between trait forgivingness and organizational forgiveness.

**Hypothesis 2c: Prediction effect of trait forgivingness on reconciliation**

As victims’ level of trait forgivingness may reflect their tendency to forgive after an offense in the workplace, which may in turn affect their tendency to reconcile, it is expected that trait forgivingness would account for the variance change in reconciliation.

**Hypothesis 2d: Prediction effect of trait forgivingness on reconciliation regardless of the number of offenses**
As mentioned above, trait forgivingness was portrayed as the disposition to forgive regardless of the situation and time while forgiveness is expected to be a predictor on reconciliation, it is expected that the interaction between trait forgivingness and the absence or presence of repeated offenses will not significantly affect the level of reconciliation, in which the presence or absence of repeated offense would not account for the variance change in the relationship between trait forgivingness and reconciliation.

Objective 3: Investigate the prediction effect of EI on trait forgivingness

Berry et al. (2001) suggested that dispositional forgiveness was related to affects, in which higher level of dispositional forgiveness was related to positive emotions while lower level of dispositional forgiveness was related to negative emotions. As EI stressed the ability to regulate and to control emotions (Davies et al., 1998) in which negative affects or thoughts may switch to positive ones to overcome distress, it is predicted to be a contributing factor towards trait forgivingness. When the level of EI is high, the level of trait forgivingness would also be high.

Hypothesis 3: Prediction effect of EI on trait forgivingness

Victims’ level of EI may reflect their level of disposition to forgive in an organizational setting. It is expected that emotional intelligence would account for the variance change in trait forgivingness.

Objective 4: Investigate the prediction effect of EI on organizational forgiveness and reconciliation

Forgiveness took place when negative feelings or emotions were replaced by positive or at least neutral ones (Worthington, 2003), in which the replacement of negative emotions with positive ones was a form of emotional regulations. Since EI deals with all kinds of abilities that
are related to emotions, it is reasonable to suggest that EI contributes to organizational forgiveness through emotional regulations. As EI also stresses the ability to use emotions to facilitate performance (Davies et al., 1998), people with high EI are able to direct their emotions to perform positively in the sense that they may be able to minimize negative emotions and thoughts, and to engage in positive reconciliation with their transgressor with an aim to perform productively and constructively at work. In view of this, the contribution of EI towards relationship make over through reconciliation will also be examined.

Hypothesis 4a: Prediction effect of EI on organizational forgiveness
Victims’ level of EI may reflect their tendency to forgive after an offense in an organizational setting. It is expected that emotional intelligence would account for the variance change in organizational forgiveness.

Hypothesis 4b: Prediction effect of EI on organizational forgiveness regardless of the number of offenses
As mentioned above, trait forgivingness was portrayed as the disposition to forgive regardless of the situation and time while EI may predict the level of trait forgivingness, thus it is expected that the interaction between EI and the absence or presence of repeated offenses will not significantly affect the level of forgiveness, where the presence or absence of repeated offense would not account for the variance in the relationship between EI and organizational forgiveness.

Hypothesis 4c: Prediction effect of EI on reconciliation
As victims’ level of EI may reflect their tendency to forgive after an offense in the workplace, which may in turn affect their tendency to reconcile, it is expected that that emotional intelligence would account for the variance change in reconciliation.
Hypothesis 4d: Prediction effect of EI on reconciliation regardless of the number of offenses

As discussed above, trait forgivingness was portrayed as the disposition to forgive regardless of the situation and time while EI may predict the level of trait forgivingness, which in turn suggests the tendency to organizational forgiveness, whereas forgiveness is expected to be a predictor on reconciliation, it is expected the interaction between EI and the absence or presence of repeated offense will not significantly affect the level of reconciliation, where the presence or absence of repeated offense would not account for the variance change in the relationship between EI and reconciliation.

Objective 5: Investigate the mediator effect of trait forgivingness between EI and organizational forgiveness as well as reconciliation

Baron and Kenny (1986) suggested that the focal independent variable would be able to influence a dependent variable through the generative mechanism of a mediator. In the present study, it is hypothesized that the independent variable, the level of EI, would be able to influence the dependent variables, the level of forgiveness and reconciliation, through the generative mechanism of trait forgivingness to restore a damaged relationship. Therefore, it is reasonable to hypothesize the level of trait forgivingness as a mediator between the level of EI and the level of forgiveness as well as reconciliation. Before a mediation model could be hypothesized, the assumptions that the independent variable (i.e. EI in this study), the mediator proposed (i.e. trait forgivingness in this study), and the dependent variables (i.e. forgiveness and reconciliation in this study) had to be confirmed to have significant correlations among each other (Baron & Kenny, 1986). The five research hypotheses stated to confirm the correlation among the variables were consistent with the hypotheses proposed earlier:
Hypothesis 5a: Synonymous to Hypothesis 3, EI would significantly account for the variation in the level of trait forgivingness.

Hypothesis 5b: Synonymous to Hypothesis 2a, trait forgivingness would significantly account for the variation in forgiveness.

Hypothesis 5c: Synonymous to Hypothesis 2c, trait forgivingness would significantly account for the variation in reconciliation.

Hypothesis 5d: Synonymous to Hypothesis 4a, EI would significantly account for the variation in the level of forgiveness.

Hypothesis 5e: Synonymous to Hypothesis 4c, EI would significantly account for the variation in the level of reconciliation.

If the above five hypotheses are confirmed, the core hypothesis, which is the mediation hypothesis, could then be addressed:

Hypothesis 5f: Once trait forgivingness is added to EI in predicting forgiveness and reconciliation in the mediation model, the original significant relationship of EI predicting forgiveness and reconciliation would no longer be significant.

Method

Participants.

In this study, 260 voluntary Chinese participants were recruited through friends and relatives as well as their extended personal networks. Two hundred and fifteen out of the 260 participants returned signed consents together with the assigned questionnaires for data analysis. Two hundred and three out of the 215 participants gave valid data to the study, while the remaining 12 participants were dropped out because most of the questions were not answered.
Of the valid participants (N = 203), there were 86 males and 117 females respectively. According to the demographics self-report, 41.9% of the participants ranged between age 20 and 29, 29.1% ranged between age 30 and 39, and 29.1% were above age 40. In terms of religion, 51.2% of the participants had no religious background, 42.2% of them were Christians, 3% were Catholics, and 3.4% were Buddhists.

All 203 participants were full-time employees. 24.1% of the participants worked in the service industry, 27.1% of them worked in the commercial field, 17.7% of them worked in the education sector, and the remaining 31% worked in other professions.

**Materials.**

Since only Chinese participants were recruited, all research materials were prepared in Chinese so that the participants could better understand the items presented. A consent form, a questionnaire (either questionnaire A or questionnaire B) and a debriefing form were given to the participants in this study. The study began with a consent form from which the participants acknowledged understanding the purpose of the research as well as their right as research participants, and then the participants started to fill out the questionnaire. A debriefing form was given to the participants in the end for further research purpose clarifications.

Two versions of questionnaires (questionnaire A and questionnaire B) were prepared with a baseline scenario and a scenario with manipulated condition which would be discussed below. All scenarios were real life examples borrowed from Lau (2004) with some modifications. In the original scenario developed by Lau (2004), apology and post apology behavior after an offense were demonstrated to measure forgiveness level upon post apology consistency. However, the elements of apology and post apology behavior were taken out in this study so as
to prevent them to be potential extraneous variables as they were not the purpose for investigation.

In this study, the questionnaires were comprised of six parts. Emotional intelligence and repeated offense were identified as independent variables, organizational forgiveness and reconciliation were regarded as dependent variables, while trait forgivingness was proposed to be a mediator between emotional intelligence and organizational forgiveness as well as reconciliation.

Part one and two of the questionnaires were comprised of an emotional intelligence measurement (WEIS). Part three of the questionnaires was a measure of trait forgivingness (HFS).

Part four of the questionnaires was a baseline scenario of offense with a measurement of organizational forgiveness (TRIM-12) and reconciliation. The baseline scenario was an offending situation in the workplace that acted as a pre-test before manipulation to rule out any possible extraneous variables such as offense severity and offender’s responsibility (Lau, 2004). Participants were asked to imagine being Coworker A. In the scenario, Coworkers A and B were responsible for a presentation of an important bidding project. Nevertheless, Coworker B arrived late and did not prepare well for the presentation. Even worst, he raised the bidding price for the project without the consensus of Coworker A at all. Finally they lost the bid and were blamed by their supervisor. Participants were asked to fill out the measurements of organizational forgiveness (TRIM-12) and reconciliation after reading the baseline scenario. Questionnaire A and B were identical from part one to four.

Part five of the questionnaires contained a manipulated scenario with different editions for questionnaire A and B. As mentioned above, repeated offense was one of the independent
variables in this study, thus it was manipulated by a presentation of one of two conditional scenarios in part five of the questionnaires. The conditional scenarios acted as post-test after manipulation. Questionnaire A contained conditional scenario A in which repeated offense was absent while questionnaire B contained conditional scenario B in which repeated offense was present after the offense in the baseline scenario. In part five, the participants were again asked to imagine being Coworker A in which he would have to cooperate with coworker B again on an important promotion project. In conditional scenario A, coworker B was well prepared for the presentation of the project and discussed sincerely with coworker A before the presentation. In conditional scenario B, coworker B arrived late again on the presentation. In addition, without coworker A’s agreement, coworker B changed the design of the promotion venue which increased the total cost by 25 percent, and explained that he did not have time to discuss with coworker A. Participants were asked to fill out the measurements of organizational forgiveness (TRIM-12) and reconciliation again after reading either conditional scenario.

Part six of the questionnaires were comprised of demographical items including participants’ gender, age range, religious backgrounds and field of professions.

(See Appendix A for the research materials)

Procedures.

Two hundred and sixty questionnaires (130 questionnaires A and 130 questionnaires B respectively) were distributed through relatives and friends, as well as their extended personal networks. One hundred questionnaires (50 questionnaires A and 50 questionnaires B respectively) were distributed by me to my relatives, friends and ex-coworkers either in person or through email communications. In addition, five voluntary administrators, who were my personal friends, helped to solicit and identify potential participants through their personal networks including
relatives, friends and coworkers. Participants who were assigned questionnaire A participated in condition group A (with conditional scenario A) while those assigned questionnaire B participated in condition group B (with conditional scenario B). All participants were asked to read and sign a consent form that explained the research purpose and assured anonymity. Participants were asked to complete either questionnaire from part one to part six. Consent forms and questionnaires were returned for data analysis once the whole set of questionnaire were completed by the participants. At the end, debriefing forms regarding further explanation of the research purpose were distributed to and kept by the participants.

*Measures.*

**Measurement of Emotional Intelligence.**

The 40-item Wong’s Emotional Intelligence Scale (WEIS) was employed to measure the level of emotional intelligence of the participants (Wong et al., 2004). The original WEIS was divided into two parts. The first part was comprised of 20 different situations with two possible reactions in which the participants were forced to choose one option that better reflected their likely reaction in each situation. The second part was comprised of 20 different pairs of abilities that the participants were forced to choose the option that reflected their strength between each pair. The WEIS was translated into Chinese for participant’s better understanding of the item descriptions (Wong et al., 2004). The two parts were incorporated into one rating scale to measure general emotional intelligence level. High WEIS scores indicated high emotional intelligence, and vice versa. WEIS was claimed to have acceptable reliability for research purposes (Wong, Wong, & Law 2007), and thus was chosen to measure emotional intelligence in this study. (See Appendix B for the original English version of WEIS)

**Measurement of Trait Forgivingness.**
The 18-item Heartland Forgiveness Scale (HFS) was used to measure the level of trait forgivingness of the participants because it was reported to have high internal consistency reliability ($\alpha > .85$) (Thompson, et al., 2005). The original 7-point rating scale was revised to a 6-point rating scale to minimize the central tendency of responses in this study.

All the questions of the original HFS were translated into Chinese for participant’s better understanding of the item descriptions. High scores on the HFS reflected high level of trait forgivingness while low scores on the HFS represented the opposite.

In addition, the original HFS was comprised of three subscales. Six items comprised the Self Subscale that measured the forgiveness toward the self; another six items comprised the Other Subscale that measured the forgiveness toward others; yet another six items comprised the Situation Subscale that measured the forgiveness toward situations. In terms of reliability, all of the three HFS subscales reported satisfactory internal consistency ($\alpha > .70$) (Thompson, et al., 2005). Nevertheless, only the data for the subscales of the forgiveness toward others and situations would be analyzed as they were more related to the context manipulated in this study. (See Appendix C for the original HFS)

**Measurement of Organizational Forgiveness.**

The Transgression-Related Interpersonal Motivation Inventory -12 Items Form (TRIM-12) was employed to measure the participants’ level of organizational forgiveness at both the baseline and the manipulated conditional scenarios because it was reported to have high internal consistency reliability (12 items, $\alpha = .86$) (McCullough et al., 1998). The original 5-point rating scale of TRIM-12 was revised to a 6-point rating scale to minimize the central tendency of responses in this study (Lau, 2004). In addition, the original TRIM-12 consisted of two subscales. Seven items comprised the Avoidance Subscale that measured motivations for avoiding an
offender, while five items comprised the Revenge Subscale that measured motivations for seeking revenge. As the original 12 items were negatively framed in order to indicate victim’s motivation to seek revenge and to avoid the offender, one item was positively framed to indicate the absence of avoidance motivation which helped to minimize a response set from the participants (Lau, 2004).

Similar to the HFS, the questions of the original TRIM-12 were translated into Chinese to enhance participants’ understanding of the item descriptions (Lau, 2004).

Low scores on the TRIM -12 represented an absence of motivations of avoidance and revenge towards the offender, which might reflect forgiving behavior toward the offender. High scores indicated unforgiveness. Nevertheless, in order to be consistent with the scoring directions of emotional intelligence and the level of trait forgivingness to prevent potential confusion in results interpretation, all of the forgiveness scores collected in the TRIM-12 were input in a reverse manner for data analysis in this study. Therefore, high scores indicated forgiveness in this study, and vice versa (Lau, 2004). (See Appendix D for the original TRIM-12)

Measurement of Reconciliation.

Two items were drawn from the original three-item Attempt on Reconciliation developed by A. Chao (personal communication, March 11, 2008 ) to measure the participants’ level of reconciliation at both the baseline and the manipulated conditional scenarios. Both reconciliation items were translated into Chinese to enhance participant’s understanding of the item descriptions. A 6-point rating scale was used to minimize the central tendency of responses in this study. High scores on the questions indicated high level of reconciliation attempt, and vice versa. (See Appendix E for the original reconciliation items)

Results
Reliability Checks

Measurement of Emotional Intelligence

Based on the data collected for this study, the overall WEIS had moderate internal consistency (α = .61), and factor analysis was conducted with the oblimin option that two factors were drawn based on the 40-item WEIS. One of the factors (namely EI1) was only comprised of the items located in part two of the original WEIS, and it reported a relatively higher internal consistency (15 items, α = .73) than the other factor (namely EI2) which was comprised of a mixture of both part one and two of the original WEIS (three items from part one and five items from part two, α = .60). Thus, any further data analysis for Emotional Intelligence would be based on EI1 in this study as it provided higher reliability in terms of internal consistency. High scores on EI1 indicated higher emotional intelligence, while low scores on EI1 indicated lower emotional intelligence.

Measurement of Trait Forgivingness

Based on the data collected for this study, the internal consistency of the whole HFS was moderate (α = .76). However, looking into the internal consistency of the three subscales, the internal consistency of the Self Subscale was quite low (α = .45), while that of the Other Subscale (α = .62) and the Situation Subscale (α = .66) was relatively higher compared to the Self Subscale. Nevertheless, as discussed above, only the Other Subscale and the Situation Subscale of the HFS would be employed for further data analysis to measure trait forgivingness in this study.

Measurement of Organizational Forgiveness

Based on the data collected for this study, the internal consistency for the total TRIM-12 Scale (12 items, α = .89 for the baseline scenario; 12 items, α = .92 for the conditional scenarios)
and both the Avoidance Subscale and the Revenge Subscale were high ($\alpha > .80$ for both the baseline and the conditional scenarios). Therefore, the data analysis on organizational forgiveness for this study would be based on all the items included in TRIM-12.

**Measurement of Reconciliation**

Based on the data collected for this study, the two reconciliation items had high internal consistency (two items, $\alpha = .87$ for the baseline scenario; two items, $\alpha = .93$ for the conditional scenario), and thus the two items would be used to measure reconciliation in this study.

**Baseline Checks**

Two hundred and fifteen questionnaires were collected but 12 of them were dropped because the participants did not complete most of the questions, which left 203 valid responses to this study. Among the 203 participants, 87 participants were assigned to complete questionnaire A while 116 of them to questionnaire B. Results indicated that there was no significant difference between the participants who were assigned questionnaire A and questionnaire B in terms of demographics (except the field of profession), as well as emotional intelligence and trait forgivingness.

**Demographics**

Chi-square tests and two-tailed independent group $t$-tests were conducted for participants’ gender, age range, religious background, and field of profession for the conditional groups, while no significant differences in the means between the two groups were found except for the field of profession.

**Gender.** Condition group A was comprised of 38 males (43.7%) and 49 females (56.3%), while Condition group B was comprised of 48 males (41.4%) and 68 females (58.6%). A chi-
square test indicated that there were no significant differences in the means between the two conditional groups $\chi^2(1, N = 203) = .108, p > .05$.

*Age.* In condition group A, 40.2% of the participants ranged between ages 20 and 29; 28.7% ranged between ages 30 and 39; and 31% aged above 40. In condition group B, 43.1% of the participants ranged between ages 20 and 29; 29.3% ranged between ages 30 and 39; and 27.6% aged above 40. A two-tailed independent group *t*-test confirmed that there were no significant differences in the means between the two conditional groups $t(201) = .533, p > .05$.

*Religious background.* In condition group A, 52.9% of the participants reported to have no religion background; 42.5% reported to be either Christians or Catholics; and 4.6% reported to be Buddhist. In condition group B, 50% of the participants reported to have no religion background; 47.4% reported to be either Christians or Catholics; and 2.6% reported to be Buddhist. A chi-square test suggested that there were no significant differences in the means between the two conditional groups: $\chi^2(1, N = 203) = 2.379, p > .05$.

*Profession.* In condition group A, 25.3% reported to be working in the service industry; 29.9% reported to be in the commercial field; 8% reported to be in the education sector; and 36.8% reported to have other working professions. In condition group B, 23.3% reported to be working in the service industry; 25% reported to be in the commercial field; 25% reported to be in the education sector; and 26.7% reported to be working in other professions. A chi-square test showed that there were significant differences in the means between the two conditional groups: $\chi^2(1, N = 203) = 10.199, p < .05$. The main difference was accounted by the people who were in the education sector as only 8% of the people in condition group A worked in the education sector, while 25% of the people in condition group B worked in the education sector. The difference might be due to a non-random questionnaire distribution.
**Emotional Intelligence**

The average score on emotional intelligence (EI1) of condition group A was 11.11 ($M = 11.11, SD = 2.58$) and that of condition group B was 10.73 ($M = 10.73, SD = 3.31$). A two-tailed independent group $t$-test indicated that there were no significant differences in the means between the two conditional groups: $t (201) = .926, p > .05$.

**Trait Forgivingness**

The average score on trait forgivingness toward others (HFS- Other Subscale) of condition group A was 25.06 ($M = 25.06, SD = 3.32$) and that of condition group B was 24.50 ($M = 24.50, SD = 3.65$). A two-tailed independent group $t$-test suggested that there were no significant differences in the means between the two conditional groups: $t (201) = 1.119, p > .05$.

The average score on trait forgivingness toward situations (HFS- Situation Subscale) of condition group A was 23.30 ($M = 23.30, SD = 3.41$) and that of condition group B was 22.66 ($M = 22.66, SD = 3.93$). A two-tailed independent group $t$-test suggested that there were no significant differences in the means between the two conditional groups: $t (201) = 1.222, p > .05$.

**Manipulation Checks**

Although the scenarios were borrowed from Lau (2004) and the manipulations were all successful, the present study made some modifications to Lau’s scenarios (i.e. the elements of apology and the post apology behavior consistency were taken out). Thus, manipulations checks were conducted to assess (1) the successfulness of the Baseline Scenario of the present study for ruling out potential extraneous variables (e.g. offense severity and the offender’s responsibility) for the offense, and (2) the successfulness of the Conditional Scenarios of the present study to serve as manipulation. The results of two-tailed independent group $t$-tests between the absence and presence of repeated offense suggested all manipulations were successful:
(1) Baseline Scenario was successful to rule out potential extraneous variables

The average score of the tendency to forgive for condition group A in the baseline scenario was 46.76 ($M = 46.76, SD = 9.27$) and that of condition group B was 48.76 ($M = 48.76, SD = 9.67$). A two-tailed independent group $t$-test indicated that there were no significant differences in the means between the two conditional groups: $t (201) = -1.485, p > .05$.

The average score of the tendency to reconcile for condition group A in the baseline scenario was 7.34 ($M = 7.34, SD = 1.90$) and that of condition group B was 7.68 ($M = 7.68, SD = 2.16$). A two-tailed independent group $t$-test indicated that there were no significant differences in the means between the two conditional groups: $t (201) = -1.156, p > .05$.

According to the $t$-test results, both the tendency to forgive and to reconcile did not have significant differences between the two conditional groups, which suggested that the two groups were approximately equal. Therefore, the Baseline Scenario was able to serve the purpose to rule out potential extraneous variables, such as offence severity and offender’s responsibility.

(2) Conditional scenarios were successful to serve as manipulations

The average score of the tendency to forgive for condition group A in the conditional scenario was 56.44 ($M = 56.44, SD = 9.17$) and that of condition group B was 43.52 ($M = 43.52, SD = 10.19$). A two-tailed independent group $t$-test indicated that there were significant differences in the means between the two conditional groups: $t (201) = 9.325, p < .05$.

The average score of the tendency to reconcile for condition group A in the conditional scenario was 8.56 ($M = 8.56, SD = 1.97$) and that of condition group B was 6.58 ($M = 6.58, SD = 2.34$). A two-tailed independent group $t$-test indicated that there were significant differences in the means between the two conditional groups: $t (201) = 6.401, p < .05$. 
According to the t-test results, both the tendency to forgive and to reconcile showed significant differences between the two conditional groups, which suggested that with the manipulation (with/without repeated offense by the offender), participants perceived that the offender did not engage in repeated offense in condition group A, while participants perceived that the offender engaged in repeated offense in condition group B.

**Research Findings**

The present study served five main objectives. (1) Investigate the positive relationship between forgiveness and reconciliation. (2) Investigate the prediction effect of trait forgivingness on organizational forgiveness and reconciliation. (3) Investigate the prediction effect of EI on trait forgivingness. (4) Investigate the prediction effect of EI on organizational forgiveness and reconciliation (5) Investigate the mediator effect of trait forgivingness between EI and organizational forgiveness as well as reconciliation.

(1) Investigate the positive relationship between forgiveness and reconciliation.

Research hypothesis 1 stated that organizational forgiveness would account for the variance change in reconciliation. A stepwise regression analysis was conducted to test the hypothesis for organizational forgiveness in predicting reconciliation. All the demographical items, emotional intelligence, and trait forgivingness were controlled to rule out any possible extraneous variables.

Results indicated that emotional intelligence significantly explained a variance of 2.9% \( [F (1, 201) = 6.093, p < .05] \) on reconciliation, trait forgivingness toward others significantly explained an additional variance of 12.5% \( [F (1, 200) = 18.328, p < .05] \) on reconciliation, while trait forgivingness toward situations significantly explained an additional variance of 3.7% \( [F (1, 199) = 15.746, p < .05] \) on reconciliation. Having all these variables controlled, organizational
forgiveness significantly accounted for an additional variance of 20.6% \( F(1, 198) = 32.643, p < .05 \) on reconciliation. (See Table 1) In sum, research hypothesis 1 was supported as organizational forgiveness accounted for the variance change in reconciliation, and it was thus confirmed to be a potential predictor of reconciliation.

(2) Investigate the prediction effect of trait forgivingness on organizational forgiveness and reconciliation.

Research hypothesis 2a stated that trait forgivingness would account for the variance change in organizational forgivingness. A stepwise regression analysis was conducted to test the hypothesis for trait forgivingness toward both others and situations in predicting organizational forgivingness. All the demographical items plus emotional intelligence were controlled to rule out any possible extraneous variables.

Among the demographical items, age was found to be a predictor of organizational forgivingness as it significantly explained a variance of 2.2% \( F(1, 201) = 4.420, p < .05 \) on organizational forgivingness with the other demographical items served as controlled variables. Age was also indicated to be positively correlated with organizational forgivingness with \( \beta = .147, t(201) = 2.102, p < .05 \). Nevertheless, emotional intelligence significantly explained an additional variance of 2.6% \( F(1, 200) = 4.954, p < .05 \) on organizational forgivingness. However, with trait forgivingness toward others added to the previous stepwise regression analysis for age and emotional intelligence predicting organizational forgivingness, trait forgivingness toward others explained an additional variance of 6.7% \( F(1, 199) = 8.523, p < .05 \) on organizational forgivingness significantly than age and emotional intelligence. (See Table 2a)

Furthermore, with trait forgivingness toward situations added to the regression analysis, it significantly explained an additional variance of 1.9% \( F(1, 198) = 7.611, p < .05 \) on
organizational forgiveness than age, emotional intelligence, and trait forgivingness toward others. (See Table 2a) Therefore, trait forgivingness toward situations also reported a significant relationship in predicting organizational forgiveness.

Research hypothesis 2b stated that the presence or absence of repeated offenses would not account for the variance change in the relationship between trait forgivingness and organizational forgiveness. A stepwise regression analysis for the interaction of conditional scenarios (with/without repeated offenses) and trait forgivingness (both toward others and toward situations) in predicting organizational forgiveness was conducted to test the hypothesis. Again, all the demographical items plus emotional intelligence were controlled to rule out any possible extraneous variables.

With age and emotional intelligence being controlled, interactions between the conditional scenarios and trait forgivingness toward both others and situations did not predict organizational forgiveness significantly as there were no variance change when the interaction variable was added to the regression analysis. Therefore, no significant interaction effect between the manipulated conditional scenarios and trait forgivingness toward both others and situations in predicting organizational forgiveness were found in the analysis.

Research hypothesis 2c stated that trait forgivingness would account for the variance change in reconciliation. A stepwise regression analysis was conducted to test the hypothesis for trait forgivingness toward both others and situations in predicting reconciliation. All the demographical items plus emotional intelligence were controlled to rule out any possible extraneous variables.

Results from the regression analysis indicated that emotional intelligence significantly explained a variance of 2.9% \( F(1, 201) = 6.093, p < .05 \) on reconciliation. (See Table 2b)
Therefore, emotional intelligence was confirmed to be a potential predictor to reconciliation. Nevertheless, with trait forgivingness toward others added to the previous stepwise regression analysis for emotional intelligence predicting reconciliation, trait forgivingness toward others explained an additional variance of 12.5% \( F(1, 200) = 18.328, p < .05 \) on reconciliation significantly than emotional intelligence. (See Table 2b) Therefore, a significant relationship of trait forgivingness predicting reconciliation was suggested by the regression analysis.

Furthermore, with trait forgivingness toward situations added to the regression analysis, it significantly explained an additional variance of 3.7% \( F(1, 199) = 15.746, p < .05 \) on reconciliation than emotional intelligence and trait forgivingness toward others. (See Table 2b) As a result, trait forgivingness toward situations also reported a significant relationship in predicting organizational forgiveness.

Research hypothesis 2d stated that the presence or absence of repeated offenses would not account for the variance change in the relationship between trait forgivingness and reconciliation. A stepwise regression analysis for the interaction of conditional scenarios and trait forgivingness (both toward others and toward situations) in predicting reconciliation was conducted to test the hypothesis. Again, all the demographical items plus emotional intelligence were controlled to rule out any possible extraneous variables.

With emotional intelligence being controlled and the interactions between the conditional scenarios and trait forgivingness (both toward others and toward situations) added to the regression analysis, no significant interaction effect between the manipulated conditional scenarios and trait forgivingness toward others in predicting reconciliation was found during the regression analysis. On the other hand, the interaction between the conditional scenarios and trait forgivingness toward situations reported no variance change towards reconciliation \( F(1, 198) = \)
Therefore, no significant interaction effect between the manipulated conditional scenarios and trait forgivingness toward situations with reconciliation was reported.

(3) The prediction effect of emotional intelligence on trait forgivingness.

Research hypothesis 3 stated that emotional intelligence would account for the variance change in trait forgivingness. A stepwise regression analysis was conducted to test the hypothesis. All the demographical items were controlled to rule out any possible extraneous variables.

Among the demographical items, age was found to be a predictor of trait forgivingness toward others as it significantly explained a variance of 5.7% \[ F(1, 201) = 12.097, p < .05 \] on trait forgivingness toward others with the other demographical items served as constants. Age was indicated to be positively correlated with trait forgivingness toward others with \[ \beta = .238, t(201) = 3.478, p < .05 \]. Nevertheless, with emotional intelligence added to the regression analysis, emotional intelligence significantly explained an additional variance of 11.3% \[ F(1, 200) = 20.498, p < .05 \] on trait forgivingness toward others. (See Table 3a) As a result, with all the demographical items controlled, emotional intelligence was suggested to be a potential predictor to trait forgivingness toward others.

Beside trait forgivingness toward others, age was also found to be a predictor of trait forgivingness toward situations as it significantly explained a variance of 6.3% \[ F(1, 201) = 13.492, p < .05 \] on trait forgivingness toward situations with the other demographical items served as constants. Age was also indicated to be positively correlated with trait forgivingness toward situations with \[ \beta = .251, t(201) = 3.673, p < .05 \]. However, with emotional intelligence added to the regression analysis, emotional intelligence significantly explained an additional variance of 6.6% \[ F(1, 200) = 14.761, p < .05 \] on trait forgivingness toward situations. (See
Table 3b) Therefore, with all the demographical items controlled, emotional intelligence was suggested to be a potential predictor to trait forgivingness toward situations.

(4) Investigate the prediction effect of EI on organizational forgiveness and reconciliation.

Research hypothesis 4a stated that emotional intelligence would account for the variance change in organizational forgiveness. A stepwise regression analysis was conducted to test the hypothesis. All the demographical items were controlled to rule out any possible extraneous variables.

As mentioned above, age was found to be a predictor of organizational forgiveness as it significantly explained a variance of 2.2% \[ F(1, 201) = 4.420, p < .05 \] on organizational forgiveness with the other demographical items served as controlled variables. Age was also indicated to be positively correlated with organizational forgiveness with \[ \beta = .147, t(201) = 2.102, p < .05 \]. Nevertheless, with emotional intelligence added to the regression analysis, emotional intelligence significantly explained an additional variance of 2.6% \[ F(1, 200) = 4.954, p < .05 \] on organizational forgiveness. (See Table 2a) As a result, with all the demographical items controlled, emotional intelligence was suggested to be a potential predictor to organizational forgiveness.

Research hypothesis 4b stated that the presence or absence of repeated offense would not account for the variance in the relationship between EI and organizational forgiveness. A stepwise regression analysis for the interaction of conditional scenarios and EI in predicting organizational forgiveness was conducted to test the hypothesis. Again, all the demographical items were controlled to rule out any possible extraneous variables.

With age being controlled, the interaction between the conditional scenarios and EI did not predict organizational forgiveness significantly as there were no variance change when the
interaction variable was added to the regression analysis \( F(1, 200) = 2.201, p > .05 \). (See Table 4) Therefore, no significant interaction effect between the manipulated conditional scenarios and emotional intelligence in predicting organizational forgiveness were found in the analysis.

Research hypothesis 4c stated that emotional intelligence would account for the variance change in reconciliation. A stepwise regression analysis was conducted to test the hypothesis. All the demographical items were controlled to rule out any possible extraneous variables.

As mentioned above, results from the regression analysis indicated that emotional intelligence significantly explained a variance of 2.9% \( F(1, 201) = 6.093, p < .05 \) on reconciliation. (See Table 2b) Therefore, EI was significantly predictive to reconciliation.

Research hypothesis 4d stated that the presence or absence of repeated offenses would not account for the variance change in the relationship between EI and reconciliation. A stepwise regression analysis for the interaction of conditional scenarios and EI in predicting reconciliation was conducted to test the hypothesis. Again, all the demographical items were controlled to rule out any possible extraneous variables.

With age being controlled, the interaction between the conditional scenarios and EI did not predict reconciliation significantly as there was no variance change when it was included in the regression analysis. In addition, the result suggested that there was no significant interaction effect between the manipulated conditional scenarios and EI in predicting reconciliation. Therefore, interactions between the conditional scenarios and EI were not a significant predictor to reconciliation.

(5) Investigate the mediator effect of trait forgivingness between EI and organizational forgiveness as well as reconciliation.
Research hypothesis 5a stated that EI would significantly account for the variation in the level of trait forgivingness, which was synonymous to hypothesis 3. As discussed earlier, hypothesis 3 was supported and thus hypothesis 5a was automatically supported.

Research hypothesis 5b stated that trait forgivingness would significantly account for the variation in forgiveness, which was synonymous to hypothesis 2a. As mentioned earlier, hypothesis 2a was supported and thus hypothesis 5b was automatically supported.

Research Hypothesis 5c stated that trait forgivingness would significantly account for the variation in reconciliation which was synonymous to hypothesis 2c. As discussed above, hypothesis 2c was supported and thus hypothesis 5c was automatically supported.

Research hypothesis 5d stated that EI would significantly account for the variation in the level of forgiveness, which was synonymous to hypothesis 4a. As mentioned above, hypothesis 4a was supported and thus hypothesis 5d was automatically supported.

Research hypothesis 5e stated that EI would significantly account for the variation in the level of reconciliation, which was synonymous to hypothesis 4c. As discussed above, hypothesis 4c was supported and thus hypothesis 5e was automatically supported.

Since all the above five hypotheses are confirmed, the core hypothesis, which is the mediation hypothesis, would then be addressed as follows:

Research hypothesis 5f stated that once trait forgivingness is added to EI in predicting forgiveness and reconciliation in the mediation model, the previous significant relationship of EI predicting forgiveness and reconciliation would no longer be significant.

A significant relationship of trait forgivingness toward others in predicting organizational forgiveness was suggested by the regression analysis [$\beta = .283, t (199) = 3.869, p < .05$], which
turned the significant relationship of emotional intelligence predicting organizational forgiveness $[\beta = .163, t(200) = 2.322, p < .05]$ to be insignificant $[\beta = .066, t(200) = .911, p > .05]$. 

Trait forgivingness toward situations also reported a significant relationship in predicting organizational forgiveness $[\beta = .157, t(198) = 2.106, p < .05]$, which slightly reduced the significant effect of trait forgivingness toward others $[\beta = .283, t(199) = 3.869, p < .05]$ to $[\beta = .234, t(199) = 3.073, p < .05]$.

In addition, a significant relationship of trait forgivingness toward others in predicting reconciliation was suggested by the regression analysis $[\beta = .382, t(200) = 5.449, p < .05]$, which turned the significant relationship of emotional intelligence predicting reconciliation $[\beta = .172, t(201) = 2.468, p < .05]$ to be insignificant $[\beta = .028, t(200) = .4001, p > .05]$. 

Nevertheless, trait forgivingness toward situations also reported a significant relationship in predicting reconciliation $[\beta = .213, t(199) = 3.016, p < .05]$, which slightly reduced the significant effect of trait forgivingness toward others $[\beta = .382, t(200) = 5.449, p < .05]$ to $[\beta = .309, t(200) = 4.243, p < .05]$. 

Since the previous significant relationship of EI predicting forgiveness and reconciliation was no longer significant after trait forgivingness was entered into the analysis, trait forgivingness is thus a mediator between EI and forgiveness as well as reconciliation.

**Discussion**

**General Discussion**

A growing body of research was done on forgiveness among psychologists, which suggested that forgiveness was an important topic to be discussed as forgiveness might promote healthy relationships in times of conflicts (McCullough & Witvliet, 2002). A number of studies focused on the topic of the benefits of organizational forgiveness, while other research
investigated the reasons behind forgiveness. Among those reasons, previous research seemed to have focused more on offenders’ behavior after the offense, which affected the victims’ decision to forgive, such as the presence of apology (McCullough, Worthington, & Rachal, 1997; Weiner, Graham, Peter, & Zmuidinas, 1991). Nevertheless, other research suggested that people’s personality and empathic disposition might affect the victims’ desire to forgive (Berry et al., 2001). People’s personality, such as agreeableness and emotional stability, were found to be closely related to forgiveness (Walker & Gorsuch, 2002), and they were characteristics of emotional intelligence in terms of emotional control and regulation. Although these dispositional characteristics were examined, there seemed to be no particular study that investigated the effect of emotional intelligence on forgiveness, which should be an area to be explored. In addition, previous studies suggested that forgiveness and reconciliation were not identical, but were closely related to each other (Zechmeister & Romero, 2002). In order to avoid reconciliation to serve as a potential extraneous variable, it was examined as another dependent variable beside forgiveness in this study. Therefore, the main objective of this study was to investigate the relationship between emotional intelligence, forgiveness and reconciliation. In addition, the mediation effect of trait forgivingness between emotional intelligence and forgiveness, and between emotional intelligence and reconciliation were also examined.

In the present study, results supported research hypothesis 1, that organizational forgiveness significantly predicted reconciliation. The confirmed relationship set a stepping stone for the investigation of the impact of the potential forgiveness related variables (i.e. emotional intelligence and trait forgivingness) on reconciliation.

In addition, the effect of trait forgivingness on organizational forgiveness and reconciliation was confirmed in the present study. Research hypothesis 2a was supported as trait
forgivingness toward both others and situations were confirmed to be potential predictors to organizational forgiveness. In addition, results suggested that interaction effect of manipulated conditional scenarios and trait forgivingness was not found in predicting organizational forgivingness. Thus, research hypothesis 2b was supported as the presence or absence of offense did not significantly affect relationship between trait forgivingness toward both others and situations and organizational forgivingness, which indicated that trait forgivingness would predict organizational forgiveness regardless of the number of offenses, and thus confirmed that people who possessed a higher level of trait forgivingness would grant forgiveness to offenders across situations over time (Berry et al., 2001). Moreover, hypothesis 2c was supported as trait forgivingness toward both others and situations were confirmed to be potential predictors to reconciliation. Last but not least, results indicated that interaction effect of manipulated conditional scenarios and trait forgivingness was not found in predicting reconciliation. Thus, research hypothesis 2d was supported as the presence or absence of repeated offense did not significantly affect the relationship between trait forgivingness and reconciliation, which indicated that trait forgivingness would predict reconciliation regardless of the number of offenses. Thus, it is confirmed that people who possessed a higher level of trait forgivingness would try to reconcile with offenders across situations over time. In no doubt, the promising results supporting hypotheses 2a to 2d paved the road for investigating the mediation effect of trait forgivingness between emotional intelligence and organizational forgiveness as well as reconciliation, which will be discussed later. Meanwhile, the effect of emotional intelligence on trait forgivingness had to be confirmed before the investigation of the mediation effect of trait forgivingness could take place.
The result of this study supported research hypothesis 3 as emotional intelligence was confirmed to be a potential predictor to trait forgivingness, which allowed the further examination of the effect of emotional intelligence on organizational forgiveness as well as on reconciliation.

Results indicated that research hypothesis 4a was supported as emotional intelligence was confirmed to be a potential predictor to organizational forgiveness. In addition, results suggested that interaction effect of manipulated conditional scenarios and emotional intelligence was not found in predicting organizational forgiveness. In this case, research hypothesis 4b was supported that the presence or absence of repeated offense did not significantly affect the relationship between emotional intelligence and forgiveness, and thus confirmed that people who possessed a higher level of emotional intelligence would tend to be more forgiving toward offenders across situations over time. Moreover, research hypothesis 4c was supported as emotional intelligence was confirmed to be a potential predictor to reconciliation. Last but not least, results indicated that interaction effect of manipulated conditional scenarios and emotional intelligence was not found in predicting reconciliation. Therefore, research hypothesis 4d was supported as the presence or absence of repeated offense did not significantly affect the relationship between emotional intelligence and reconciliation, and thus confirmed that people who possessed a higher level of emotional intelligence would try to reconcile with offenders across situations over time.

Finally, results of the present study confirmed that there is a mediation effect of trait forgivingness between emotional intelligence and organizational forgiveness as well as reconciliation. The significant effects of emotional intelligence on organizational forgiveness as well as on reconciliation and the significant effects of trait forgivingness on organizational
forgiveness as well as on reconciliation suggested that both emotional intelligence and trait forgivingness were predictors to organizational forgiveness and to reconciliation. Taking one step further, the previous significant relationship of EI predicting forgiveness and reconciliation was no longer significant after trait forgivingness was added into such relationship. As a result, the effects of EI on forgiveness as well as on reconciliation are mainly mediated by trait forgivingness. (See Figure 1)

Beside the above hypotheses confirmation, age was found to be a predictor toward forgiveness, and yet was masked by both EI and trait forgivingness when they were entered in the scenario to predict forgiveness. Nevertheless, the relationship between age and forgiveness suggested that when people grow older, they tend to be more forgiving.

Implications

Previous studies revealed that forgiveness was beneficial to organizational functioning, in which coworkers in conflicts could restore their relationship. As a result, worker cooperation and organizational productivity would be fostered, whereas employees’ declining efficiency, absenteeism, and turnover would also be reduced (Cameron et al., 2004; Worthington, Berry, Shivy, & Brownstein, 2005). In addition, Metts, Cupach, and Lippert (2006) suggested that organizational forgiveness could facilitate relationship repair between victims and offenders after interpersonal conflicts. As previous studies tended to focus solely on organizational forgiveness, the present study took a step further to examine the effect of forgiveness on reconciliation, which confirmed that forgiveness attempts had a significant impact on reconciliation tendencies. This implies that victims would try not only to forgive, but also to reconcile with offenders, which then helps to promote a better working environment in organizational settings.
In addition, the present study added credits to previous research that attempted to understand why some people are more forgiving than the others. Previous studies revealed that people’s personality, such as emotional stability and empathic dispositions might affect the victims’ desire to forgive (Berry et al., 2001; Walker & Gorsuch, 2002). The present study added insight to the view of the emotional elements of the tendency to forgive as well as to reconcile. Findings highlighted that emotional intelligence played a significant role in forgiveness as well as in reconciliation. The implication of the prediction effect of emotional intelligence on forgiveness and on reconciliation could be applied to organizational settings, such as staff recruitment. As forgiveness and reconciliation were proposed to be beneficial to organizational functioning, it is worth to investigate the factors behind to drive forgiveness and reconciliation. In this study, emotional intelligence is confirmed to be one of them. Since emotional intelligence was identified to be a potential predictor to forgiveness and reconciliation, which might in turn promote organizational functioning, organizations might want to recruit potential employees with higher emotional intelligence and screened out candidates with lower emotional intelligence.

What’s more, Bradfield and Aquino (1999) proposed that training programs could help to encourage forgiveness by increasing the awareness among workers about the potential benefits of forgiveness. Nevertheless, the findings of the present study shed light on other training programs with the aim to increase forgiveness tendency at times of conflicts. Organizations might want to develop training programs with an aim to enhance EI in the current workers, so as to enhance their forgiving tendency in a peripheral way. Therefore, employees’ EI would be enhanced with forgiveness and reconciliation tendency increased when encountering organizational conflicts as well as interpersonal offenses. Since no interaction effect of the
presence or absence of repeated offenses was found to affect the impact of EI (as well as trait forgivingness) on forgiveness and reconciliation, EI was thus contributed to forgiveness as well as reconciliation regardless of the number of offenses encountered. In this case, having employees trained to have higher emotional intelligence, organizational citizenship could then be fostered, and healthy organizational functioning could be achieved. In view of this, future research may focus on the development of training programs that address emotional intelligence, forgiveness, as well as reconciliation in organizational settings.

Last but not least, findings of the present study gave rise to a mediating model of emotional intelligence, trait forgivingness, forgiveness, and reconciliation. As discussed above, trait forgivingness acted as a mediator between emotional intelligence and forgiveness, as well as between emotional intelligence and reconciliation. The mediating model confirmed that trait forgivingness is a significant predictor to forgiveness and reconciliation, yet through which emotional intelligence could have impact on both forgiveness and reconciliation. The model seemed to have implied that trait forgivingness might be mediators for other variables that were found to have effect on forgiveness as well as reconciliation. Future studies may explore the mediation effect of trait forgivingness between forgiveness as well as reconciliation and other variables that were studied to have impact on the two constructs, for example, offenders’ apology.

Limitations

The present study was significant that it helped to clarify the individual differences of emotional intelligence and trait forgivingness in organizational forgiveness and reconciliation. It is definitely worthwhile to conduct more in-depth studies among these constructs in the future. Before proceeding, several limitations in the present study would be addressed that are noteworthy to future researchers.
First, the present study was based on correlational analysis methods, no causal relationship between emotional intelligence, trait forgivingness, forgiveness, and reconciliation was revealed. Although it was found that emotional intelligence was a potential predictor to forgiveness and reconciliation, a victim with higher emotional intelligent does not cause him to forgive or to reconcile. To address the cause-effect relationship, future researchers may conduct pilot studies to explore the initial EI and forgiveness as well as reconciliation level of the participants, and then assign a group of participants (i.e. experimental group) to receive emotional training while consider the remaining participants as the control group. After the experimental group received the training on EI, both the experimental group and the control group might be tested again on their EI and forgiveness as well as reconciliation level. If there is a significant difference between the two groups assuming that the EI was enhanced for the experimental group, a cause-effect relationship between emotional intelligence and forgiveness as well as reconciliation could then be studied. Nevertheless, it is encouraged to allow the participants in the control group to receive EI training if they wished after the test was over in order to minimize ethical issues in human manipulation (Kelman, 1965).

Second, the present study was conducted through self-reported questionnaires. Participants did not engage in an actual involvement of offenses. This may reduce the effects that might have occurred in situations experienced in real life (Stone & Kotch, 1989). According to Pierce and Aguinis (1997), realism could be enhanced by using virtual-reality technology and watching video tapes, so that the relationship observed could be interpreted more accurately.

Third, due to the time constraint, data of the baseline scenario as well as the conditional scenarios for the present study were collected at one point in time that the present study was designed based on a cross sectional nature. As a result, this study did not reflect a lasting effect
where longitudinal studies might provide. If time allows, future studies may collect data for the baseline scenario first, and postpone data collection of the conditional scenarios in one or two weeks so as to examine whether a lasting effect may occur.

Fourth, only a general EI indicator (WEIS) from which one factor was teased out to be used for analysis in the present study as the internal consistency was quite low for the whole WEIS measurement. Pilot studies are recommended before measurements are selected for future research so as to facilitate a more refined examination on the proposed construct. In addition, future researchers were also suggested to explore the relationship between EI and trait forgivingness more extensively. As four abilities were addressed based on the construct of EI (Wong et al. 2004), it is thus worthwhile to examine which ability might be a more relevant factor contributing to trait forgivingness that would in turn affect the level of forgiveness as well as reconciliation.

Fifth, similar to the limitation addressed above, the internal consistency of the measurement to test trait forgivingness in terms of forgiving others and situations yielded a lower Cronbach alpha than the originals. This may be due to translation effect since the original measurement was developed in English but was translated into Chinese to enhance understanding for Chinese participants in this study. In addition, there might be cultural differences in the interpretation of forgiveness between the Chinese and the Western culture. Prospective researchers who were interested in the area might develop more practical measurements to assess trait forgivingness in the Chinese context so as to facilitate better investigation on the proposed construct (Lau, 2004).

Literally, limitations existed in every single research because of time constraints and resources boundary, yet the addressed limitations did not greatly harm the significant findings of
the present study (Lau, 2004). In spite of the above limitations, the present study did contribute significantly to existing research on organizational forgiveness as no empirical research had yet attempted to investigate the impact of emotional intelligence on forgiveness as well as on reconciliation.

Conclusion

Organizational forgiveness has been substantially studied to facilitate cooperation and restore relationship among coworkers in times of conflicts (Aquino et al., 2003; Cameron et al., 2004; Fitzgibbons, 1986; Metts et al., 2006; Worthington et al., 2005). Results from the present study suggested reconciliation might go hand in hand with organizational forgiveness to promote a better working environment through relationship restoration. In addition, emotional intelligence was identified to be a contributor to organizational forgiveness as well as reconciliation with the mediation effect of trait forgivingness. Therefore, emotional intelligence is an important aspect to help relationship restoration through forgiveness. Organizations should develop training programs for employees in order to enhance their emotional intelligence so as to help them work out better relationships at times of offenses and conflicts.
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Appendix A

Consent Form

研究資料提供同意書

本人 Cathy Leung 爲香港大學心理學系心理學學士後證書課程之學生，現正於本人之論文導師 Dr. Harry Hui 的指導下進行一項有關人際關係的畢業論文研究。因此，現在誠意邀請閣下參與是項研究。你只需提供簡單的個人資料，以及完成此份問卷，便可為此項研究提供寶貴的資料作分析用途。閣下有權於研究進行中任何時候中止參與，完成整份問卷大約需要二十分鐘。

本問卷分六部份，請按照次序填寫，直至整問卷完成為止。

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

若有任何疑問或查詢，歡迎直接與本人 Cathy Leung (電話：9819 4046；電郵地址：cathyl@hku.hk)或本人之論文導師 Dr. Harry Hui (電話：2859 2291；電郵地址：huiharry@hku.hk)聯絡。如果閣下對作爲參與者的權利有任何疑問或查詢，請联络香港大學的 Human Research Ethics Committee (電話：2241 5267)。

非常感謝你對是次人際關係研究的支持和參與。

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

簽署 ___________________________ 日期 ___________________________
## Questionnaire Part One – Measurement of Emotional Intelligence

問卷內容

第一部份

您對不同情況的反應

以下 20 個不同的情況，請填寫您會採取的行動（即選 a 或 b）：

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>項目</th>
<th>描述</th>
<th>選項</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>當你情緒很低落時，你會：&lt;br&gt; (a) 嘗試找一些事來做使自己好一點。&lt;br&gt; (b) 不加理會，因為你知道你的情緒會自然回復正常。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>當你心情煩亂時，你會：&lt;br&gt; (a) 與一些和你親密的人傾訴感受。&lt;br&gt; (b) 把精力集中在一些事情（如工作、學習或嗜好）上，藉以自己不好的感受。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>你的上司指定你做一件超出你工作範圍的任務，而你又對這份額外工作毫無興趣，你會：&lt;br&gt; (a) 與一些對你有任務的人傾訴感受，並尋求他們的意見。&lt;br&gt; (b) 告訴上司此任務超出你的工作範圍，並要求他另找另外適當的人選去負責此任務。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>李明發前一份工作是在某公司的熱線電話部門，負責回答及處理顧客的投訴，他不喜歡此工作，所以便換了現在的工作，現時他任職一間零售店，職務是招待到零售店客戶的顧客，但是，他又感到自己對處理無理顧客時感到非常厭惡。如果你是李明，你會：&lt;br&gt; (a) 與一些對顧客服務有經驗的人傾訴，並尋求他們的意見。&lt;br&gt; (b) 嘗試接受多一些關於顧客服務技巧的訓練及教育。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>你是某一公司的部門主管，公司有兩個互相競爭及關係惡劣的副總裁，他們都想控制你的部門，因此你經常左右做人難，而且這情況導致一些公司的規定含糊不清，使你的部門很難正常運作。面對這樣的情形，你會：&lt;br&gt; (a) 假設不知道兩個副總裁的鬥爭（因為辦公室政治是無可避免的），讓他們爭鬥，而你按從最後定案的規定。&lt;br&gt; (b) 努力找出問題及問題，藉以讓你的部門可正常運作。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>假設你贏取了一個很重要的獎項，你會：&lt;br&gt; (a) 告訴每個人並與他們分享你的快樂。&lt;br&gt; (b) 告訴你的家人及最親近的朋友，並與他們慶祝獲獎。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>假設你做了一些你不喜歡的事情時，你會：&lt;br&gt; (a) 嘗試從中找出一些有趣的地方。&lt;br&gt; (b) 嘗試盡快做完，然後忘記它。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>你的男/女朋友很喜歡某流行音樂明星你花了兩小時排隊買了這明星音樂會的門票，你約了男/女朋友在晚上七時半見面，但到八時半他/她還沒有出現，你便自己進場，音樂會後你找到他/她，在你開口前，他/她便很嚴重地一直責備你。你會：&lt;br&gt; (a) 讓他/她在理應，等他/她責備完後，告訴他/她在進場前已邀了他/她一個小時。&lt;br&gt; (b) 立刻制止他/她，並告訴他/她在責備別人前應該先考慮自己的錯誤。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>今天你如常上班。當你離開地下鐵站時才發覺錢包不見了；一踏入辦公室，你的上司便指你的工作；剛開工之前，你的電腦又壞了。很明顯今天對你來說並不幸運而你對此並不愉快。你會：&lt;br&gt; (a) 不要緊，嘗試找另外一部電腦並開始工作。&lt;br&gt; (b) 在工作前，先與一位同事或朋友傾訴，藉以宣泄了不愉快的情緒。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. 彼得是你的同事，他很聪明並且見多識廣，可以很有效率的與位高權重的人溝通。你的上司指定你和彼得一起處理一個計劃，彼得有很多突然來的意念，但他都把困難和實時的工作推給你。你會：
   (a) 與彼得討論及堅持他應分擔你的工作。
   (b) 告訴你的上司，希望他/她能作出忠告或幫忙。

11. 當你面對學業或事業上的問題時，你會：
   (a) 與朋友討論並尋求建議。
   (b) 自己處理，因為每個人都應該面對自己的生活。

12. 假設你正在求職。你很喜歡某份工作，但會成功受聘的機會很微。你會：
   (a) 仍然申請並盡力為此準備得最好。
   (b) 把精力集中在申請其他你較有機會得到聘任的工作上。

13. 有一天你代表公司歡迎兩名來自俄羅斯的投資者。根據俄羅斯的習俗，他們會親吻首次見面的人。不過，你對於要親的陌生人感到很不自在，尤其是他們和你是同一性別的。你會：
   (a) 在見面時立即主動與他們握手，藉以避免親吻。
   (b) 親吻他們以表示尊重。

14. 某一個夏天的星期日，你與男/女朋友騎車到海濱，希望享受陽光，但在途中發生輕微的意外，你的車門受損，估計費用一筆錢去修理。你會：
   (a) 把車開到相熟的修車店，然後乘公車（巴士）到海濱。
   (b) 繼續按計劃開車到海濱，經些才修理車門。

15. 明天你要參加一個重要的考試，因此你在房裡努力溫習。你的家人正在收看一個你也很喜歡的電視節目，由於你的房子比較小，所以電視的聲音干擾了你的溫習。你會：
   (a) 要求家人關掉電視，但以錄影機把節目錄下，然後明天晚上再與家人一起觀看。
   (b) 雖然有點不太舒服，但你會戴耳筒（藉以減低電視的聲音）然後專心溫習。

16. 當一個朋友因為不開心来找你時，你會：
   (a) 與他/她分擔他/她的感受。
   (b) 寶他/她做一回他/她喜歡的事情。

17. 當某人一直與你爭論一些無關痛癢的事情時，你會：
   (a) 不作回應及等待他/她停止。
   (b) 假裝同意他/她的看法，然後轉而討論其他事情。

18. 你的一位朋友氣質欠佳，因此他/她與某男/女朋友的關係並不和諧。當這名朋友向你傾訴此不和諧的關係時，你會：
   (a) 假裝同意他/她認為某男/女朋友不夠好的觀點是正確的。
   (b) 指出這是你朋友自己的錯，並希望他/她會改善。

19. 余彩詩是一名獨女，她與父母非常親密。她是一個很有責任感的人，工作表現極好，同事們也很喜歡她。最近她媽媽因病倒臥病床，至今尚未復蘇。餘餘彩詩擔憂，但她沒有請假在家工作。你會：
   (a) 讓她如常工作，因為工作可分擔她精神上負荷。
   (b) 指派少一些工作給她，並把其他工作推到較輕的職位。

20. 你的一名下屬在生下第一個女嬰後回家上班已一個月。你知道她育兒的健康情況並不太好，因此她回家為她及在工作上犯了很多不小心的錯誤。在請假期前她的工作表現是很理想的，但他因賓賓她過去很長時間的工作表現，你會：
   (a) 直接告訴她你對她工作表現不滿意，與她討論如何改善。
   (b) 指派少一些工作給她，或把她調到工作較輕的職位。
**Questionnaire Part Two – Measurement of Emotional Intelligence**

第二部份

個人不同方面的能力
以下是二十對關於人不同方面能力的形容，請您評估自己這些方面的能力。在每一對能力中，請圈選您自己較強的一項（即a或b）。

請注意，就算您覺得自己兩方面的能力均不錯，您仍需圈選對您來說，相對較強的一項。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(a) 握自己高興或不高興原因的能力。</th>
<th>(b) 學習修理一部新的家庭電器的能力。</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(a) 心算的能力。</td>
<td>(b) 控制自己情緒的對另。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(a) 學唱一首新歌的能力。</td>
<td>(b) 專注於完成自己目標的能力。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(a) 從別人行行為到他們真實感受的能力。</td>
<td>(b) 體能上比別人更能忍受身體上痛苦的能力。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(a) 在不意時鼓勵自己努力面對困難的能力。</td>
<td>(b) 學習畫圖畫的能力。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(a) 掌握自己情緒變化的對另。</td>
<td>(b) 學習跳新舞步的能力。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(a) 比別人跑得快的能力。</td>
<td>(b) 慰怒時比別人更快冷靜下來的能力。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(a) 觀察事物細節的能力。</td>
<td>(b) 觀察別人情緒的能力。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(a) 比別人更有運動方面的能力。</td>
<td>(b) 比別人更能明白自己感受的能力。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(a) 使用機械工具的能力。</td>
<td>(b) 控制自己脾氣的能力。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(a) 掌握一首歌的旋律的能力。</td>
<td>(b) 為自己訂下的目標而努力不懈的能力。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(a) 從別人的言行中了解他們情緒的能力。</td>
<td>(b) 體能上比別人更能持久運動的能力。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(a) 比別人的手腳更靈活。</td>
<td>(b) 比別人更清楚自己情緒的能力。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>(a) 需要時，很快記憶電話號碼的能力。</td>
<td>(b) 慰怒時，控制不發脾氣的能力。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>(a) 積極鼓勵自己面對挫折的能力。</td>
<td>(b) 學習製作美術作品（如陶瓷、繪畫）的能力。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>(a) 瞭解別人情緒的能力。</td>
<td>(b) 分辨別人唱歌水準高低的能力。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>(a) 面對壓迫的人或事時保持情緒平靜的能力。</td>
<td>(b) 能記得陌生人名字的能力。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>(a) 鼓勵自己要要做到最好的能力。</td>
<td>(b) 學習一種運動項目（例如球類運動）的能力。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>(a) 敏銳地洞悉別人情緒的能力。</td>
<td>(b) 欣賞戲劇或電影創作的能力。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questionnaire Part Three – Measurement of Trait Forgivingness

第三部份

在我們的生活中，總會有不如意的事情發生，原因可能是因爲我們自身的行爲，身邊的人的行爲，甚至是我們不能控制的環境。在事情發生後，我們或會有很多不同的負面思想或情緒，不論是對自己，他人以及環境。試想想您在遇到這些事情時的即時反應，並將他們從1-6分別評級，按照下列指標圈出你的答案。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>極為不會</th>
<th>不會</th>
<th>頗為不會</th>
<th>不會</th>
<th>頗為會</th>
<th>會</th>
<th>極為會</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>雖然初時我會爲自己出錯而感到不快，但時間能讓我清楚事情並不是想像中的糟糕。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>我會怨恨我自己做錯了事。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>從錯誤中學習，能讓我更快過度不開心的感覺。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>我難以接受如此糟糕的自己。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>我會用時間去了解自己所犯的錯誤。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>我會不停的批判自己的過失，不論是感覺，思想，言語或是行爲。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>我會不斷的懲罰一個我認爲他做錯事的人。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>我會用時間去了解別人所犯的錯誤。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>我會嚴厲的對付損害過我的人。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>經常因受損害過我的人，我依然會覺得他們是好人。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>別人對我不公，我會一直的詛咒他們。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>經常有人令我失望，我也能夠很快的渡過不開心的情緒。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>當事情是不能夠處理的時候，我會將負面的情緒壓抑。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>時間能讓我理解人生的挫折。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>當有不能控制的情況令我失望時，我會不斷的產生負面思想。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>面對人生中的挫折，我都能平靜的面對。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>我很難接受挫敗不是人為的原因。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>面對不能控制的情況，我能夠放下負面的思想。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questionnaire Part Four – Baseline Scenario

第四部分

假设你是事件中的受害者，细阅以下事件后，请回答有关问题。

假设你的上司要你和同事甲合作，为某大企业的一项大型招标项目撰写计划书，且到该公司发表。你和同事甲已经合作过几次，算是合作无间，上司都很放心把工作交给你们。

在计划书发表当日，同事甲因晚上玩得太累而睡过头，他不但迟到，也没有作好准备。在你不知情的情况下，他更把你们一早商议好的投标价由三十万港币增加到四十万港币。最后因你们的表现不佳和投标价略高，你们的计划书没有被接纳。那可观的佣金因此而泡汤，亦因为这样而被上司责骂。

你有多大可能会对同事甲作出以下的事情？请按照下列指圈出你的答案。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>我会令同事甲得到教训。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>我会疏远同事甲。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>我希望不幸的事会发生在同事甲身上。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>我会忽视同事甲，使他不在我生活中。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>我不会再信任同事甲。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>我希望同事甲得到应得的教训。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>我会友善地对待同事甲感到为难。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>我会逃避同事甲。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>我会向同事甲取回我应得的。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>我会与同事甲断绝关系。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>我希望见到同事甲受重伤和苦难。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>我会离开同事甲。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>我会尽量与同事甲保持友好，并关心他／她。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>我会与同事甲重新修复关系。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questionnaire Part Five – Conditional Scenario A (absence of repeated offense)

第五部份

承接着第一部份發生的事件，請繼續閱讀以下接著發生的事，然後回答問題。

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>項目</th>
<th>回答</th>
<th>回答</th>
<th>回答</th>
<th>回答</th>
<th>回答</th>
<th>回答</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>我會令同事甲得到報應。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>我會疏遠同事甲。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>我希望不幸的事會發生在同事甲身上。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>我會忽視同事甲，便他不存在我的生活中。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>我不會再信任同事甲。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>我希望同事甲得到應得的報應。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>我對友善地對待同事甲感到羞恥。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>我會逃避同事甲。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>我會向同事甲取回我應該得到的。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>我會與同事甲斷絕關係。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>我不希望見到同事甲受傷害和苦難。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>我會離開同事甲。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>我盡量與同事甲保持友好，並關心他／她。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>我試圖與同事甲重新修補關係。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questionnaire Part Five – Conditional Scenario B (presence of repeated offense)

第五部份

承接著第一部份發生的事件，請繼續閱讀以下接著發生的事，然後回答問題。

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>我會令同事甲得到報應。</th>
<th>我會疏遠同事甲。</th>
<th>我希望不幸的事會發生在同事甲身上。</th>
<th>我會忽視同事甲，便他不存在我的生活中。</th>
<th>我不會再信任同事甲。</th>
<th>我希望同事甲得到報應。</th>
<th>我會友善地對待同事甲，感到寄生。</th>
<th>我會逃避同事甲。</th>
<th>我會向同事甲取回我應該得到的。</th>
<th>我會與同事甲保持距離。</th>
<th>我不希望看到同事甲受傷害和苦難。</th>
<th>我會離開同事甲。</th>
<th>我盡量與同事甲保持友好，並關心他／她。</th>
<th>我試圖與同事甲重新修補關係。</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questionnaire Part Six - Demographics

第六部份 個人資料

性别： □ 男性  □ 女性
宗教： □ 沒有  □ 基督教  □ 天主教  □ 佛教  □ 其他
年龄： □ 19 岁以下 □ 20 - 29 岁 □ 30 - 39 岁 □ 40 岁或以上
职业： □ 服务行业  □ 商业  □ 教育  □ 其他

全問卷完。謝謝你對本研究的參與和支持。
Debriefing Form

研究目的

近年來有研究調查饒恕的原因。當中有些研究暗示情緒智商可能會左右受害人對冒犯者的饒恕決擇。並且，情緒智商能減輕他們因憤怒而導致的心理及生理毛病。但是，在辦公室裡，有時候縱使冒犯者在犯錯後道歉，卻沒有得到受害者的饒恕，並影響工作上的合作關係。其中一個原因可能與受害者的情緒智商的高低有關，即受害人能否有效地控制情緒，從而決定是否饒恕及和解，以令工作不致受到影響。本研究的目的就是要調查受害者的情緒智商會否影響受害人饒恕冒犯者並作出和解。

閣下提供的所有資料只供學術用途，將絕對保密。

若有任何疑問或者諮詢，歡迎直接與本人Cathy Leung聯絡（電話：9819 4046；電郵地址：cathyl@hku.hk）。如果閣下對作爲參與者的權利有任何疑問或者諮詢，請聯絡香港大學的Human Research Ethics Committee（電話：22415267）。

非常感謝你對人際關係研究的支持和參與。
Appendix B

The Original Wong’s Emotional Intelligence Scale, WEIS – English Version

Part A:
For each of the following 20 situations, there are two possible reactions. Please circle the alphabet of the action (i.e., either A or B) that you will have a stronger chance of taking.

1. When you are very down, you will:
   A. Try to do something to make yourself feel better.
   B. Just ignore it because you know your emotion will be back to normal naturally.

2. When you are upset, you will:
   A. Talk to someone who is close to you about your feeling.
   B. Concentrate on some matters (e.g., work, study, or hobby) so that you can get away from your bad feelings.

3. Your supervisor assigns a task that is not included in your job responsibility and you do not have any interest in doing it. You will:
   A. Persuade yourself that the task is not that bad and perform the task.
   B. Tell your boss that you don’t like the task and ask him to find some other suitable person to do the task.

4. Johnny was working in Hotline Department and his job was to handle complaint and answered customer enquiry. However, he did not like his job and so he found another job in a hotel, serving walk-in customers. He again found that he was sick and tired in handling unreasonable customers. If you were Johnny, you will:
   A. Try to get more training and education in customer service skills.
   B. Talk to some experienced people in customer service and seek their advice.

5. Two managers in your company were hostile and very competitive with each other. You were the head of a department. You were caught at the middle of these two managers because both of them wanted to gain control of your department. This made your department difficult to function normally because there was a lot of confusion in rules and regulations for your department. You will:
   A. Pretend that you do not know about the competition between the two managers because politics is always unavoidable. You will led them fight and follow the finalized rules and regulations.
   B. Try your best to make the rules and regulations clearer so that your department can function normally.

6. Suppose you get an important award, you will:
   A. Tell everyone and share your happiness with them.
   B. Tell and celebrate only with your family and closest friends.
7. When you have to do something you don’t like, you will:
A. Try to find some interesting stuff from it.
B. Try to finish it as soon as possible and forget about it.

8. Your boy/girl friend is a fan of a particular pop music star. You spend two hours to buy two tickets for this star’s concert. You asked him/her to meet you at 7:30 p.m. After one hour s/he did not show up. You therefore went to the concert yourself. After the concert, you found your boy/girl friend. Before you said anything, s/he kept on scolding you seriously. You will:
A. Let him/her continue. After s/he finished, tell him/her that you have already waited for him/her for one hour.
B. Stop him/her immediately. Tell him/her that s/he should consider his/her lateness before scolding others.

9. Today you go to work as usual. After getting off the MTR (Subway), you found out that you lost your wallet. Soon after arriving the office, your boss complained about your work. When you started to work, your computer was broken. It is clear that today is very unlucky for you and you are not happy about it. You will:
A. Never mind, try to find another computer to start your work.
B. Talk to a colleague or friend to release the bad feeling before starting your work.

10. Your colleague, Peter, is a very smart person and seems to know a lot. He is able to respond effectively and sensitively towards the people who are in high positions. Your boss asked you to work with him in a project. Peter has many flashing ideas but he leaves you to handle all the dirty and donkey tasks. You will:
A. Discuss with Peter and insist to share your tasks with him.
B. Tell your boss about the situation and see if s/he can offer any advice and/or help.

11. When you face problems regarding your career or study, you will:
A. Talk to your friends to seek advice.
B. Handle the problem yourself because everyone should deal with his/her own life.

12. You have very little chance to get the offer of a job which you like very much. You will:
A. Still apply for this job and try to prepare well for it.
B. Concentrate your efforts on jobs that you have better chances to get offer.

13. One day, you represent your company to welcome two important investors from Russia. According to Russian custom, people will kiss each other the first time they meet. However, you feel very uncomfortable to kiss unknown people, especially for those with the same gender as yours. You will:
A. Take the initiative to shake hand with them immediately when they appear to avoid the kissing.
B. Kiss them to show your respect.
14. One Sunday in summer, you and your boy/girl friend drove to the beach to enjoy the sunshine. On the way you had a minor accident. The door of your car was damaged and it would cost some money to repair it. You will:
A. Drive the car to a familiar mechanic and take the bus to the beach.
B. Go to the beach as planned and fix the car later.

15. You have an important examination tomorrow and you are studying hard in your room. Your family is watching a television program which you like very much as well. Since your house is small and so the noise of the television annoys you. You will:
A. Ask your family to turn off the television but videotape the program so that you and your family can watch it together tomorrow after your examination.
B. Although a little bit uncomfortable, you put a headphone on (to reduce the noise) so that you can concentrate on your study.

16. When a friend comes to you because s/he is not happy, you will:
A. Share his/her feeling.
B. Takes him/her to do something s/he likes.

17. When someone keeps on arguing with you on some unimportant topics, you will:
A. Do not respond to him/her and wait for him/her to stop.
B. Pretend to agree with his/her views and switch the discussion to other topics.

18. Your friend has a rough relationship with his/her boy/girl friend because your friend has a bad temper. When your friend talks to you about the rough relationship, you will:
A. Pretend to agree with him/her that his/her boy/girl friend is not good enough.
B. Point out that it is your friend’s own fault and hope that s/he will improve.

19. Joyce is the only daughter of her parents. She is very close to her parents and is a very responsible person. Her job performance is excellent and colleagues like her. Recently her mother had a very serious traffic accident and is in coma. Although Joyce worries a lot, she does not take her leave and tries to do her best at work. If you were Joyce’s supervisor, you will:
A. Let her come to work as usual because she can have her work to distract her worries.
B. Assign less work to her so that she can go to the hospital in a more flexible way.

20. One of your subordinates has just come back to work after giving birth to her first baby girl for one month. You know that her baby girl’s health condition is not very good. Thus, you found out that in this month she had been making careless mistakes and took sick leave frequently. She had good performance before the baby was born. However, you are certainly not satisfied with her performance in this month. You will:
A. Tell her directly that you did not satisfy with her work and discussed with her how she could improve the situation.
B. Assign less work to her or transfer her to other position with lighter work load.
Part B:

The following are 20 pairs of abilities. In each pair, please judge which ability is stronger for you. Then circle the alphabet (i.e., either (a) or (b) that represents this ability.

(note: you may be strong or weak on both abilities. However, what you need to judge is the relatively stronger one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability concerning:</th>
<th>Ability concerning:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Comprehend the reasons of being happy or unhappy</td>
<td>(b) learn how to repair a new electric appliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (a) mental arithmetic</td>
<td>(b) control one’s emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (a) learn how to sing a new song</td>
<td>(b) concentrate on achieving one’s goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. (a) understand others’ true feelings by observing their behaviors</td>
<td>(b) tolerate physical pain when compared to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. (a) Comprehend one’s changes in emotions</td>
<td>(b) earn how to dance some new steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. (a) run faster than others</td>
<td>(b) calm down faster than others from angry feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. (a) encourage oneself to work hard in unfavorable situations</td>
<td>(b) learn how to draw or paint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. (a) observe details of things</td>
<td>(b) observe others’ emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. (a) having a better ability in sport activities than other people</td>
<td>(b) having a better ability in understanding one’s own feeling than other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. (a) use mechanical instruments</td>
<td>(b) control one’s temper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. (a) Comprehend the rhythm of a song</td>
<td>(b) set objectives and work hard towards them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. (a) understand others’ emotions from their behaviors and language</td>
<td>(b) having better physical endurance than other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. (a) physically more energetic than others</td>
<td>(b) understand one’s emotions better than others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. (a) memorize new phone numbers quickly</td>
<td>(b) not losing temper when angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. (a) motivate oneself to face failure positively</td>
<td>(b) learn to create an artistic object (e.g., china, painting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. (a) Comprehend the rationale of complicated problems</td>
<td>(b) understand others’ emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. (a) evaluate one’s own bad emotions</td>
<td>(b) evaluate others’ singing abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. (a) keep emotionally calm when facing disguised people or situations</td>
<td>(b) memorize strangers’ names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. (a) encourage oneself to do the best</td>
<td>(b) learn a new sport activities (e.g., soccer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. (a) Comprehend others’ emotions quickly and accurately</td>
<td>(b) appreciate the creativity of a movie or a drama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Wong et al., 2004
Appendix C

The original Heartland Forgiveness Scale; HFS

Directions: In the course of our lives negative things may occur because of our own actions, the actions of others, or circumstances beyond our control. For some time after these events, we may have negative thoughts or feelings about ourselves, others, or the situation. Think about how you typically respond to such negative events. Next to each of the following items write the number (from the 7-point scale below) that best describes how you typically respond to the type of negative situation described. There are no right or wrong answers. Please be as open as possible in your answers.

<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>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td>More Often</td>
<td>More Often</td>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False of Me</td>
<td>False of Me</td>
<td>True of Me</td>
<td>True of Me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

___ 1. Although I feel bad at first when I mess up, over time I can give myself some slack.
___ 2. I hold grudges against myself for negative things I’ve done.
___ 3. Learning from bad things that I’ve done helps me get over them.
___ 4. It is really hard for me to accept myself once I’ve messed up.
___ 5. With time I am understanding of myself for mistakes I’ve made.
___ 6. I don’t stop criticizing myself for negative things I’ve felt, thought, said, or done.
___ 7. I continue to punish a person who has done something that I think is wrong.
___ 8. With time I am understanding of others for the mistakes they’ve made.
___ 9. I continue to be hard on others who have hurt me.
___ 10. Although others have hurt me in the past, I have eventually been able to see them as good people.
___ 11. If others mistreat me, I continue to think badly of them.
___ 12. When someone disappoints me, I can eventually move past it.
___ 13. When things go wrong for reasons that can’t be controlled, I get stuck in negative thoughts about it.
___ 14. With time I can be understanding of bad circumstances in my life.
___ 15. If I am disappointed by uncontrollable circumstances in my life, I continue to think negatively about them.
___ 16. I eventually make peace with bad situations in my life.
___ 17. It’s really hard for me to accept negative situations that aren’t anybody’s fault.
___ 18. Eventually I let go of negative thoughts about bad circumstances that are beyond anyone’s control.

Note: HFS total (items 1–18), HFS Self subscale (items 1–6), HFS Other subscale (items 7–12), HFS Situation subscale (items 13–18).

Source: Thompson et al., 2005
Appendix D

The original Transgression-Related Interpersonal Motivations Inventory; TRIM-12

For the questions on this page, please indicate your current thoughts and feelings about the person who recently hurt you. Use the following scale to indicate your agreement with each of the questions.

1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly agree

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

Note. Items on the Avoidance and Revenge subscales are denoted with (A) and (R), respectively.

Source: McCullough et al., 1998
Appendix E

The original Attempt on Reconciliation items

1. I make an effort to be more friendly and concerned.

2. I try to make amends.

3. I attempt to give him/her back a new start, a renewed relationship.

Source: Chao, 2008
Table 1

Regression of EI, Trait Forgivingness, and Organizational Forgiveness on Reconciliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EI1</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI1, Trait Forgivingness toward others</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI1, Trait Forgivingness toward others and situations</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI1, Trait Forgivingness toward others and situations, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Forgiveness</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictors</td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>$R^2$ Change</td>
<td>$p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, EI</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, EI, Trait Forgivingness toward others</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, EI, Trait Forgivingness toward others and situations</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2b

*Regression of EI, Trait Forgivingness, and the Interaction between Conditional Scenarios and Trait Forgivingness toward situations on Reconciliation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EI1</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI1, Trait Forgivingness toward others</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI1, Trait Forgivingness toward others and situations</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI1, Trait Forgivingness toward others and situations, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction between Conditional Scenarios and Trait Forgivingness</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3a

*Regression of Age and EI on Trait Forgivingness toward others*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, EI</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3b

*Regression of Age and EI on Trait Forgivingness toward situations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, EI1</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

*Regression of Age and the Interaction between EI and Conditional Scenarios on Organizational Forgiveness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, Interaction between Conditional Scenarios and EI1</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure Caption

*Figure 1.* Model of Mediation: A mediation pathway of emotional intelligence mediated through trait forgivingness (toward both others and situations) to forgiveness and to reconciliation.

**Path a1:** Variations in levels of emotional intelligence (the independent variable), significantly account for variation in trait forgivingness toward others (the presumed mediator) ($\beta = .343$).

**Path a2:** Variations in levels of emotional intelligence (the independent variable), significantly account for variation in trait forgivingness toward situations (the presumed mediator) ($\beta = .261$).

**Path b1:** Variations in trait forgivingness toward others (the mediator), significantly account for variations in, forgiveness (the dependent variable) ($\beta = .283$).

**Path b2:** Variations in trait forgivingness toward others (the mediator), significantly account for variations in reconciliation (the dependent variable) ($\beta = .157$).

**Path c1:** Variations in trait forgivingness toward situations (the mediator), significantly account for variations in forgiveness (the dependent variable) ($\beta = .382$).

**Path c2:** Variations in trait forgivingness toward situations (the mediator), significantly account for variations in reconciliation (the dependent variable) ($\beta = .213$).

**Path d1:** When path a1, a2, b1 & c1 were controlled, the previous significant relationship between emotional intelligence and forgiveness ($\beta = .163$), i.e., between the independent and dependent variable, is no longer significant, with the strongest mediating effect of trait forgivingness (toward others and situations) occurs when Path d1 is equal to 0.

**Path d2:** When path a1, a2, b2 & c2 were controlled, the previous significant relationship between emotional intelligence and reconciliation ($\beta = .172$), i.e., between the independent and dependent variable, is no longer significant, with the strongest mediating effect of trait forgivingness (toward others and situations) occurs when Path d2 is equal to 0.
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