

**“Motivational Factors, Self-Compassion and Rumination in
relation to Forgiving Behaviour”**

Project submitted for partial fulfilment of the degree of

MASTERS OF ARTS

IN

PSYCHOLOGY



THAPAR INSTITUTE
OF ENGINEERING & TECHNOLOGY
(Deemed to be University)

SUBMITTED BY:

Sandeep Kaur

UNDER THE SUPERVISION AND GUIDANCE OF


Dr. Surinder Kaur

School of Humanities & Social Sciences

Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology, Patiala

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled, “Motivational Factors, Self- Compassion, and Rumination in relation to Forgiving Behavior.” being submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for the award of degree of Master of Arts in Psychology, submitted in the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology, Patiala is a bonafide work carried out under the supervision of Dr. Surinder Kaur, Professor, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology, Patiala and that no part of this project has been submitted for the award of any other degree.


Sandeep Kaur

Scanned with CamScanner

(Sandeep Kaur)

This is to certify that the above statement made by the student concerned is correct and true to the best of my knowledge



(DR. SURINDER KAUR)

Professor,
SHSS Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology, Patiala

CANDIDATE'S DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the work presented in this thesis entitled, "Motivational Factors, Self-Compassion, and Rumination in relation to Forgiving Behavior." in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the award of the degree of Master of Arts in Psychology, submitted in the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology, Patiala, is an authentic record of my own work carried out under the supervision and guidance of Dr. Surinder Kaur , Professor, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology, Patiala and refers other researcher's work which are duly listed in the reference section.

The matter embodied in this thesis has not formed the basis for the award of any other degree of this or any other university.

Date: June 2022

Place: Patiala

This is to certify that the above declaration made by the student concerned is correct and true to the best of my knowledge



(DR. SURINDER KAUR)

Professor, SHSS Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology, Patiala

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

A noteworthy task is never crafted by only one person but the commitment of various individuals in their distinctive ways make this achievable. First of all, I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to my research guide, Dr. Surinder Kaur (Professor, Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology, Patiala) for her continuous support and help. Her dynamism, vision, sincerity and motivation have deeply inspired me. Working under her was a great privilege for me.

I would also like to express my gratitude to all the other teachers in the department, especially Dr. Santha Kumari (Professor, Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology, Patiala) for giving us this opportunity to conduct such researchers and help us enhance our skills to the best. Also, I would like to express my thanks to the participants, who showed their interest through participation in my study. Their efforts helped me complete my study.

At last, I would like to thank my family for their help all through and furthermore for giving me incredible support and love throughout.

Sandeep Kaur (862002023)

Table of Contents

Abstract	7
Chapter 1-Introduction	8 - 13
1.1 Self-compassion	9
1.2 Forgiveness	10
1.3 Rumination	11
1.4 Motivational factors	12
Chapter 2-Review of Literature	14 - 20
2.1 Forgiveness	14
2.2 Self-compassion and Forgiveness	15
2.3 Motivational drives and Forgiveness	18
2.4 Rumination and Forgiveness	19
Chapter 3- Research Gap, Objectives, and Rationale and Hypotheses	21
3.1 Research Gap	
3.2 Objectives	
3.3 Rationale and Hypotheses	
Chapter 4- Methodology	22 - 26
4.1 Sample	22
4.2 Research Design	
4.3 Tools Used	
4.4 Procedure	24
4.5 Instructions & Precautions	25
Chapter 5- Results	27 - 32

Chapter 6- Discussion of Results	33 - 35
Limitation of the study	
Future Research	
References	36 - 38
Appendix A	39
Appendix B	41
Appendix C	43
Appendix D	45

ABSTRACT

The objective of this study was aimed to understand how different Motivational Factors like Revenge and Avoidance motivation along with Self-compassion and Rumination will have an effect on Forgiving Behaviour. The data was collected from 150 participants (73 females and 77 males) of age range of 18-40 years. The questionnaires used were- The Heartland Forgiveness Scale (Laura Y. Thompson, C.R. Synder and Lesa Hoffman), Transgression-Related Interpersonal Motivations-12 (McCullough, M. E, 2013), Self-compassion Scale (Neff, 2003), and Rumination Response Scale (Nolen-Hoeksema, 2003). Descriptive statistics, Pearson's Correlation, Regression Analysis, Anova and Independent Sample t-test was used for analyses of the data. The findings suggest a significant positive link between Self-compassion and Forgiveness ($r = .316, p < 0.01$) and also a significant negative correlation between Rumination and forgiveness ($r = -.246, p < 0.01$). The study also found females to be more forgiving than male participants. However, there was no evidence of a link found between Motivational factors- avoidance and revenge motivation with forgiveness. Furthermore, regression analysis also revealed that 9.4% variance in forgiveness can be explained by predictor variable that is Self- compassion.

Keywords- Forgiveness, Revenge Motivation, Avoidance Motivation, Self-compassion, Rumination, and Variance.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

People often wish sometimes to exchange their damaged and fractured relationships for better functioning ones, the reality is that cutting off one relationship to pick up another with the same amount of depth and quality is not an easy process. The leaving often gets difficult in human relationships. People would be in a permanent state of seeking belongingness but never truly experiencing it if they responded to all interpersonal issues by abandoning their relationships and starting over with new ones, which would be antithetical to the underlying urge to belong that drives much human behaviour (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). So, what are people to do when they are confronted with relational difficulties? In such a case, one option is to forgive those who have wronged them. Although forgiveness is not equivalent to reconciliation but it definitely is a good start. (McCullough, Pargament, & Thoresen, 2000), People frequently find it meaningful to forgive wrongdoers in order to fulfil their need for interpersonal connectivity, and in a society where deep social relationships are incredibly difficult to form, forgiveness is the one link in the chain of relationship restoration.

Earlier, the topic of forgiveness was commonly associated with religion as it was believed that those who are religious and spiritual are usually the ones who are more forgiving.

However, since psychology has been expanding tremendously in the past years people are now very keen in understanding how others have an impact on their behaviour and how that impact further leads to forgiveness or punishment, thus, understanding who people forgive and what could be the motivations behind forgiving others. Forgiveness helps in continuing relationships by changing the injuries those offenses had brought upon their interaction.

Although we think that forgiveness always involves letting go of negative feelings towards

the transgressor, there are other motivational factors like feeling of taking revenge or avoidance that guide an individual towards this process.

1.1 Self-compassion

The concept of self-compassion has been present in Eastern philosophical thought for many centuries; it is indeed a relatively new concept for Western psychology. In the West, people usually think that compassion should be shown to others, whereas, in the Buddhist tradition it is heavily stressed that an individual must first have compassion for themselves in order to have the emotional resources available to give compassion to others (Brach, 2003). In truth, Buddhists believe that the self and others are interrelated; they argue that having compassion for others but not for oneself creates a false dichotomy between self and others. (Neff, 2004).

Self-compassion is considered as a new concept in the field of personality psychology (Neff, 2003), it is based on concepts discussed in the insight tradition of Buddhism (Brach T, 2003).

Self-compassion involves being caring and compassionate towards oneself in the face of hardship or perceived inadequacy (Bennett-Goleman, 2001). Self-compassion, according to Neff (2003), is made up of three interconnected components: self-kindness, a sense of common humanity, and mindfulness (the ability to confront painful feelings and thoughts without exaggeration, drama, or self-pity). Instead of severe self-judgment and criticism, self-kindness entails "offering kindness and understanding to oneself" (Neff, 2003). "Seeing one's experiences as part of the greater human experience rather than seeing them as dividing and isolating" is part of common humanity (Neff, 2003).

"Holding one's painful thoughts and sensations in balanced awareness rather than over-identifying with them is what mindfulness entails" (Neff, 2003). These components facilitate

a recognition and acceptance of reality as it is, and enhance the capacity to respond effectively in any given situation (Neff, 2003).

Some empirical studies have consistently demonstrated that self-compassion is significantly associated with the tendency to forgive (Neff and Pommier 2013; Zhang and Chen 2016), which is a prosocial and adaptive response to environmental and interpersonal transgressions. People with high levels of self-compassion are more likely to exhibit kindness toward themselves and can understand transgressions as an inevitable aspect of the human experience, they also accept suffering caused by transgressions. Thus, such people tend to be more forgiving toward others. Nonetheless, the fundamental cognitive and emotional processes that explain how self-compassion is linked to forgiveness till date remain unknown.

1.2 Forgiveness

Forgiveness is characterised as a motivated shift of victims' attitudes toward offenders, which involves decreasing negative feelings, behaviours, and thoughts against offenders while increasing positive emotions, behaviours, and attitudes toward them (Enright 1996; McCullough et al. 1998; Ripley and Worthington 2002). It is perceived as a "prosocial" transformation in motivations toward the offender, in a way that the individual is less vengeful and avoidant and concurrently more benevolent (McCullough, Bellah, Kilpatrick and Johnson, 2001). The "True" forgiveness includes the ability to view the offender realistically and inclusively while considering the good and bad which include having positive feelings such as compassion or empathy that are believed to be critical to forgiveness (Wade, Worthington, and Meyer, 2005). It is considered as a basic social and psychological phenomenon with deep religious roots (McCullough & Worthington, 2001). Forgiveness is said to have a positive relation to mental health (e.g., reductions in anxiety,

depression, and hostility) and wellbeing (Miller and Worthington 2010; Worthington 2006). Individuals high on forgiveness are less likely to feel depressed or anxious. Moreover, forgiveness is not only beneficial for the individual but it also helps people in handling conflict and maintaining relationships (Kachadourian et al. 2004; Wieselquist 2009). People with a high tendency to forgive others in daily life are more likely to empathize with others, express kindness, and realize the common imperfections of human beings (Fincham et al. 2006; Paleari et al. 2005). Forgiveness is likely shaped by a variety of factors, including an individual's religious or spiritual beliefs (Glazier, 2015). Importantly, forgiveness is widely recognized as distinct from pardoning (a legal term for absolving a person of his/her guilt), condoning (which entails that the offense is justifiable), excusing (which entails that there are mitigating factors that led to the offense), forgetting (which suggests that the offense is not consciously accessible), or reconciliation (which involves the restoration of the relationship (McCullough & Witvliet, 2000).

According to (Worthington & Scherer, 2003) there are two types of forgiveness which are decisional and emotional. Emotional forgiveness is the kind which is rooted inside the individual and involves emotional experiences. This type of forgiveness is also one of the coping strategies that people use to deal with transgressions whereas; decisional forgiveness involves an adjustment in the person's behavioural intentions toward the wrongdoer.

1.3 Rumination

Rumination according to (Hoeksema, 1991) is a stable maladaptive coping technique that consists of "focusing of the symptoms and the possible causes and consequences of those symptoms" and is eminent from problem solving by the absence of actions aimed to change the situation or relieve oneself from distress. In other words, it is a repetitive form of thinking

where a person repeatedly and in an abstract-evaluative way contemplate about oneself, and about the other possible causes, meaning, and implications of one's sad and depressed feelings (Watkins, 2008). There are several kinds of rumination (Helena, 2018), such as depressive rumination (a form of responding to distress that involves a repetitive and passive focus on the causes, symptoms, and consequences of one's distress or negative affect), rumination on sadness (repetitive thinking about sadness and the incident associated with it), angry rumination (repetitive thinking about personally meaningful anger-inducing events), post-event rumination (rumination focused on anxious symptoms). Rumination has been greatly studied in depression research; it is prominent as one of the important factors that predicts the onset and maintenance of depressive symptoms (Nolen-Hoeksema, 1991). By focusing on one's depressed mood and its implications on oneself, attention is further shifted away from potentially adaptive responses to negative mood, which may subsequently lead to the maintenance of depressed mood (Hong, 2007). Rumination is seen as a mechanism to account for the emergence of gender differences in depressive symptoms during adolescence (Rebecca, 2007). Evidence from adult indicates higher levels of rumination among women than men (Hoeksema, Larson, & Grayson, 1999).

1.4 Motivational Factors

McCullough 1998 gave a three-dimensional model which presented the different types of interpersonal responses to transgressions. In this model, the different types of responses include Revenge, Avoidance and Benevolence. These three-offense related relational inspirations together give an index of the degree to which one is inclined towards forgiveness. Revenge refers to delivering hurt or damage on somebody for a physical issue or wrong done to oneself. It is characterized as an attempt to cause suffering to someone who

has caused oneself some suffering (Elster, 1990). Uniacke (2000) stated that “revenge is personal and noninstrumental with revenge we seek to make people suffer because they have made us suffer, not because their actions or values require us to bring them down.”

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Forgiveness

Despite the fact that it has long been explored by theologians and philosophers, forgiveness has only recently been examined in depth in psychology. Far greater emphasis has been paid to the empirical and theoretical research of forgiveness and its implications for physical and mental health (McCullough, et al. 2000). Relationships are the foundation of how we connect with others and provide a way of support for individuals and communities, so it is a topic that deserves more consideration. Forgiveness is regarded as a changing process of pro-social behaviour, which means that people give up revenge and avoid the offender and instead choose to show kindness to the offender (Enright et al., 1998; McCullough & Hoyt, 2002).

Conflicts and offences are unavoidable in interpersonal interactions, and they have the potential to damage interpersonal relationships. After being offended, the two most common impulses toward a wrongdoer are most likely avoidance and retaliation (McCullough and Hoyt, 2002). This is because of the negative emotional responses such as fear, anger, or sadness which are prime responses toward offenses (Slotter, 2012 & Civai, 2013). People can, on occasion, set aside their instinctual urges to revenge or avoid, and instead choose forgiveness as a viable approach for maintaining a relationship (Billingsley and Losin, 2017).

Forgiveness is described as the act of diminishing disappointment and resentment associated with negative emotions, motivation, and cognition, with the goal of reducing persons' desire to seek vengeance. With forgiveness, it will reduce a person's willingness to forgive which will further have an impact on reducing negative emotions such as hatred and revenge.

Furthermore, those who forgive are frequently better at using the appropriate coping mechanisms and managing the stress they face in a certain situation. However, some research results also prove that forgiveness has no connection with happiness (Safaria, 2014). This is in agreement with the research of Batik et al. (2017) which explains that there is a positive but low relationship between forgiveness and happiness, and forgiveness is found as a significant predictor of subjective happiness. Forgiveness is said to be something which is personal, it is also independent of any gender, based on the results of research conducted by Asici (2019) there is no difference in forgiveness between women and men. In a meta-analytic review of almost 70 studies with 15,731 individuals, Miller et al. (2008) found that the gender difference in forgiveness has a small to moderate effect size, showing greater willingness to forgive among female respondents than males. Whereas, in a study done by Kaleta et al. (2021) men showed higher levels of general forgivingness and more willingness to overcome unforgiveness, especially toward oneself and situations beyond anyone's control. On the other hand, Fehr et al. (2010) conducted a meta-analysis across 53 studies with a total number of 8,366 participants, the results indicated no relationship between gender and forgiveness.

There is no substantial evidence for gender differences in forgiveness scores across a variety of forgiveness measures based on previous work (Barber, Maltby, & Macaskill, 2005; Brown & Phillips, 2005). In reviewing the literature on forgiveness in group interventions, Worthington, Sandage, and Berry (2000) showed that women are no more likely to forgive than men.

2.2 Self-compassion and Forgiveness

Self-compassion is considered as a provision of understanding and kindness towards one's experiences of failure or mistakes made by not judging yourself. In addition, in self-

compassion an individual does not criticize themselves for their weakness and indigestion (Neff, 2003). According to Allen and Leary (2010) self-compassion is considered as a strategy for dealing with problems. When a person is able to give love to themselves during hard times and consider problems as part of life. Self-compassion will try to do the best by minimizing suffering in the future because self-compassion has two sides, which are happiness and suffering (Prama, 2013). Self-kindness refers to the ability to care for and understand yourself rather than criticizing or judging yourself. Self-judgment is to reject feelings, thoughts, urges, actions. Those who have common humanity understand that difficulties and failure in life are things that are experienced by humans, but the opposite is that individuals who experience isolation see imperfection or failure as embarrassing and need to withdraw and feel alone. People with mindfulness tend to accept every event, while over-identification is more concerned with being fixated on all their faults and not accepting and exaggerating their failure. Sakiz and Saricam (2015) conducted study that found a link between self-compassion and forgiveness.

Another aspect of self-compassion that hasn't gotten enough research is how it influences one's readiness to forgive others. There are a number of theories that explain why self-compassion and forgiving of others is linked. Positive emotions, according to Fredrickson (2004), broaden people's attention and thinking, cease persistent unpleasant emotional arousal, fuel psychological resilience, develop large personal resources, drive upward spirals toward future higher well-being, and aid in total human flourishing. The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotion was named after Fredrickson (Fredrickson, 1998; 2001; 2004). As previously stated, high levels of self-compassion are significantly related with various good feelings, Fredrickson's theory can be applied to self-compassion. Positive emotions, according to Fredrickson, increase people's range of thoughts and acts by expanding their option of thinking and action.

Fredrickson put his theory to the test by giving his participants short emotional film snippets that elicited the emotions of joy, contentment, fear, and anger. Participants were then instructed to pause the film and envision themselves in a circumstance where they would experience comparable emotions. The participants were then asked to write down everything they wanted to do at that particular time. Participants in the positive emotions conditions (joy and contentment) reported more things they would like to do promptly than those in the negative emotions conditions (fear and anger) or those who watched a neutral video, according to Fredrickson (2004). A happy mood, according to Fredrickson, can demolish the effects of negative emotions by widening a person's instantaneous cognitive action process. Discovering positive meaning, according to Fredrickson, not only produces happy feeling, but also expands thinking, increasing the likelihood of finding positive meaning in later experiences (Fredrickson, 2000). Based on Fredrickson's findings, it appears logical to assume that self-compassion is linked to another pleasant emotion: forgiving others.

Self-forgiveness, which is comparable to but not the same as self-compassion, has been found to have no relation to empathy or forgiveness of others. A study by Macaskill, Maltby, and Day (2002) investigated the relationship between self-forgiveness, empathy, and forgiveness of others in a study where 324 British undergraduate students participated, it included self-forgiveness, forgiving of others, and emotional empathy measurements. The findings show that people with higher empathy levels are more likely to work toward forgiveness of others, but not necessarily forgiveness of themselves. The researchers speculated that the reason empathy was linked to forgiveness of others but not self-forgiveness was due to the fact that empathy and forgiveness of others have the same aspect of care for others (Macaskill et al., 2002).

Finally, self-compassion and self-forgiveness are not synonymous. Self-forgiveness is defined as the willingness to let go of guilt and blame for one's mistakes while growing

compassion and goodwill toward oneself (Ingersoll-Dayton & Krause, 2005). The most significant distinction between self-forgiveness and self-compassion is that self-forgiveness is an episodic process, but self-compassion is a continuous, active process. To practise self-forgiveness, the person must have done something wrong in their eyes. Self-compassion, on the other hand, is a dynamic discipline that a human cultivates regardless of wrongdoings.

2.3 Motivational Drives and Forgiveness

There are different types of motivations involved when forgiving a transgressor. These are Revenge Motivation, Avoidance Motivation and Benevolence Motivation.

In a study done by (Jiang & Ma, 2020) found that that revenge and avoidance motivation had a negative correlation with the tendency to forgive, However, people high on benevolence motivation were more likely to forgive others. Another study conducted by McCullough, Worthington & Rachal (1997) also found the people high on avoidance motivations were less likely to forgive others. Berry, et al, 2001 found that youngsters with high forgiveness show less inspiration to fight back, dodge after being abused, and are more disposed to show benevolent motivation. Ghaemmaghami, Allemand, & Martin, (2011) found age differences where younger men had a greater tendency to seek revenge as compared to older men.

According to research, reducing the drive for vengeance and avoidance can diminish the victims' anger and behaviour issues, demonstrating the mental health advantages of forgiving others (Barcaccia et al., 2017). There are disparities between different transgression-related motives and forgiveness, with a stronger link between negative motivations and forgiveness, which might be due to the fact that reducing negative motivations promotes forgiveness in teenagers.

2.4 Rumination and Forgiveness

While the study of forgiveness has grown in popularity in recent years, few researches have looked at both forgiveness and rumination. However, it appears that there is a clear connection between these two entities. If a person dwells on a previous betrayal, it's possible that he or she will find it difficult to forgive the offender. Anger and rumination are connected; according to some studies, ruminating about an anger-provoking situation is likely to result in increased anger or hostility (Rusting & Nolen-Hoeksema, 1998). McCullough et al. (2001) examined characteristics like vengefulness, forgiveness, rumination, well-being, and the Big Five in to investigations. They expected that vengefulness was inversely associated to forgiveness, subjective wellbeing, and agreeableness and was positively related to rumination on the offence, efforts to repress such ruminations, and negative affectivity/neuroticism.

They also hypothesised that spiteful persons would have lower levels of rumination and repression, lower levels of avoidance and retribution motives, and a lower level of subjective well-being over time. They also hypothesised that changes in rumination, repression, forgiveness, and life satisfaction would be linked with time. Higher vengefulness scores ruminated more, they were less forgiving, and had poorer life satisfaction and negative affect than lower vengefulness scores. As a result, persons who ruminated less and suppressed more gradually became more forgiving. In the second study, vengefulness was found to be negatively connected with conscientiousness, negatively correlated with agreeableness, and positively correlated with neuroticism. As a result, it indicates that forgiveness and ruminating have a link that needs to be explored further.

Rumination and anger have been found to be inversely connected with forgiveness in longitudinal and cross-sectional studies (Fatfouta et al. 2015; Lucas et al. 2010; McCullough

et al. 2007). Anger and rumination might result from a feeling of being threatened. When victims dwell on traumatic experiences, they relive and immerse themselves in the unpleasant thoughts and feelings that accompany them, making them less inclined to forgive.

\

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH GAP, OBJECTIVES, and RATIONALE AND HYPOTHESIS.

3.1 Research gap

The present study takes into account that how the different motivational factors like revenge motivation, and avoidance motivation along with different variables like self-compassion and rumination have an effect on forgiving behaviour of an individual. Although there are studies that measure these variables independently with forgiveness. However, there are no such studies which together measure all these factors together.

3.2 Objectives

1. To study the relationship between Motivational Drives, Self-compassion and Rumination with Forgiving Behaviour.
2. To study if there is any gender differences on forgiving behaviour

3.3 Rationale and Hypotheses

H1 Self-compassion will have a positive correlation with Forgiveness

H2 Avoidance Motivation will have a negative correlation with Forgiveness

H3 Revenge Motivation will have a negative correlation with Forgiveness

H4 Rumination will have a negative correlation with forgiveness

H5 Females will be more forgiving than males

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

4.1 Sample

Inclusion criteria for participation were 73 females and 77 males between the age group of 18 years to 40 years, who were Computer literate and well versed with English language. The survey was conducted in order to collect the required data. The sample size was 150 participants. The participants filled in their responses and their data was recorded and analyzed.

4.2 Research Design

The present study takes into account that how the different motivational factors like revenge motivation, and avoidance motivation along with variables like self-compassion and rumination will affect forgiving behavior. Although there are studies that measure these variables independently with forgiveness not many studies which together measure so many factors like motivations to forgive, self-compassion, or rumination with forgiveness.

The study is a correlational study in which Motivational drives, Self-Compassion and Rumination are the Independent Variables (IV) and Forgiveness is the Dependent Variable (DV).

4.3 Tools Used

Total 4 Scales were administered through Google forms via online medium for the collection of required data, which are as follows:

1. Heartland Forgiveness Scale (HFS)

The Heartland Forgiveness Scale is an 18-item self-reported instrument that measures dispositional forgiveness. It consists of three subscales of six items each: (a) forgiveness of self: items 1 to 6; (b) forgiveness of others: items 7 through 12; and (c) forgiveness of situations: items 13–18. Participants are asked to indicate the degree to which they identify with each sentence using a seven-point Likert scale (1 = almost always false for me, to 7= almost always true for me). A higher score reflects an individual's greater willingness to forgive others, himself (or herself), and/or situations, and vice versa. The authors report adequate internal consistency, Cronbach's alpha, with values between 0.72 and 0.87 and test–retest reliability for a 3-week interval of 0.72–0.77 and 9 months of 0.68–0.69

2. Transgression Related Interpersonal Motivation Inventory-12 (TRIM)

The Transgression-Related Interpersonal Motivations Inventory (TRIM) is a 12-item self-report questionnaire that measures the motivational changes of victims toward transgressors (McCullough et al., 2006). Two subscales were included in the TRIM: (1) the revenge subscale includes five items that measure the motivation to seek revenge (e.g., “I want him/her to get what he/she deserves”); (2) the avoidance subscale consists of seven items that assess the motivation to avoid the offender (e.g., I would avoid him/her. Each item is scored on a scale of 1–5 from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” Previous studies have demonstrated high internal consistency and reliability of each subscale, and it is also applicable in the youth sample (e.g., McCullough et al., 2000; McCullough and Hoyt, 2002; Nouri et al., 2019).

3. Self-Compassion Scale (SCS)

The Self-compassion Scale is a short self-report measure of 26 items developed by Kristin Neff, that evaluates the individual on six domains, (1) Self-Kindness; (2) Self-Judgement; (3) Common Humanity; (4) Isolation; (5) Mindfulness; & (6) Over-Identified Items. The test requires 5 to 10 minutes for administration.

The SCS is appropriate for ages 14 and up. In initial psychometric evaluation, the test-retest reliability of .93 was recorded. Scoring was done using five-point, Likert-type scale, indicating how often respondents behave in the stated manner, (where, 1 = "Almost Never"; 2 = "Never"; 3 = "Neutral"; 4 = "Always"; 5 = "Always Always"). Total self-compassion score was calculated by reverse scoring of the negative subscale items - self-judgment, isolation, and over-identification (i.e., 1 = 5, 2 = 4, 3 = 3, 4 = 2, 5 = 1) - then computing a total mean.

4. Rumination Response Scale (RRS)

Rumination Response Scale is a self-report measure consisting of 22 items, developed by Susan Nolen-Hoeksema. This scale assesses how people think or behave when they are sad, depressed, or down.

It uses a four-point, Likert-Type Scale, indicating the degree to which the respondent thinks when feeling depressed, (where, 1 = "Almost Never"; 2 = "Sometimes"; 3 = "Often"; 4 = "Almost Always") and is age appropriate for people who are 18 years and above.

4.4 Procedure

The study was conducted by sending out consent forms to 150 participants both male and females. After collecting the same, the 4 inventories, which include HFS, TRIM, SCS, and RSS were administered on these 150 participants who were within the age group of 18 to 40 years.

The consent forms and further, the tests were sent via online medium (through Google-Forms, sent via WhatsApp and E-mail). All the instructions were mentioned clearly at the top of each section in the Google Form. In case of any confusion or query the participants were free to clear the doubts via any texting medium.

4.5 Instructions & Precautions

The Instructions regarding filling the tests were mentioned clearly on the forms itself and in case of any confusion the participants were free to get in touch with the researcher, in order to get any kind of clarification.

Instructions for Heartland Forgiveness Scale (HFS) were as follows, “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.”

Instructions for Transgression Related Interpersonal Motivation Inventory-18 (TRIM) were as follows, “or the following questions, please indicate your current thoughts and feelings about the person who hurt you. Use the following scale to indicate your agreement with each of the questions.”

Instructions for Self-Compassion Scale (SCS) were as follows, “The following questions access how do you typically act towards yourself in difficult times. Read the statement and choose a number on the given scale which indicates how often you behave in the stated

manner, where 1 being 'Almost Never' and 5 being 'Almost Always.' Please read each statement carefully before answering.”

Instructions for Rumination Response Scale (RRS) were as follows, “The questions below assess how you think and do different things when you feel depressed. Please read each of the items below and indicate whether you Almost Never, Sometimes, Often, or Almost Always think or do each one when you feel down, sad, or depressed. **Please indicate what you generally do, not what you think you should do. **”

Few precautions were kept in mind while recording the responses, which were as follows:

- Informed consent was taken from each participant.
- Each participant was ensured that their responses will be kept confidential.
- All the participants were within the age group of 18 to 40 years.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS

For data analyses, mean and standard deviation for all the variables were computed.

Predicting variables used in the study were Revenge motivation, Avoidance motivation, Self compassion and Rumination. Criterion variable was Forgiveness. Descriptive statistics, independent sample t-test, Correlation, and Regression were computed using SPSS 21.0.

Table 1: Mean and Standard Deviation of Age, Motivational Avoidance, Motivational Revenge, Self-compassion, Rumination and Forgiveness.

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Age	150	27.29	3.55
Motivational Avoidance	150	30.16	3.33
Motivational Revenge	150	10.96	3.08
Self-compassion	150	18.69	2.61
Rumination	150	47.83	9.83
Forgiveness	150	74.17	9.30
The valid N			

Table 2: Correlation Analysis

	Motivation avoidance	Motivation Revenge	Self-compassion	Rumination	Forgiveness
Motivation avoidance	1				
Motivation Revenge	-.011	1			
Self-compassion	.048	-.050	1		
Rumination	.040	.236**	-.391**	1	
Forgiveness	-.142	-.107	.316**	-.246**	1

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 2 shows the correlation between Motivational factors- Revenge and Avoidance, Self compassion, and Rumination with Forgiveness. The table clearly shows a significant positive correlation between self-compassion and forgiveness($r = .316$, $p < 0.01$) and also a significant negative correlation between Rumination and forgiveness ($r = -.246$, $p < 0.01$).

Meanwhile, no significant relationship was found between Motivation avoidance and forgiveness ($r = -.142$, $p > 0.05$) and between Motivation revenge and forgiveness($r = -.107$, $p > 0.05$).

Table 3. Regression model summary of Self compassion

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Adjusted R Square
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
1 (Constant)	53.122	5.240		10.138	.000	
Self-compassion	1.126	.278	.316	4.055	.000	9.4%

a. Dependent Variable: forgiveness

Table 3 shows that predictor variable (Self compassion) contributed significantly to regression model ie. The B value of Self compassion (B=1.126, p 0.01) predicts significant increase in forgiveness. It indicates that a unit increase in Self compassion leads to 1.126unit increase in forgiveness. The value of adjusted R square which was found to be .094, which indicates that 9.4% variance in forgiveness can be explained by predictor variable that is Self-compassion.

Table 4: Correlations between subscales of Self-compassion (Self-kindness, Self-judgment, Common Humanity, Isolation, Mindfulness, and Over-identification) with Forgiveness.

	Self-kindness	Self-judgment	Common humanity	Isolation	Mindfulness	Over-identification	Forgiveness
Self-kindness	1						
Self-judgment	.206*	1					
Common humanity	.514**	.334**	1				
Isolation	.282**	.558**	.402**	1			
Mindfulness	.357**	.438**	.539**	.448**	1		
Over-identification	.341**	.537**	.466**	.473**	.468**	1	
Forgiveness	.159	.208*	.249**	.250**	.231**	.261**	1

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4 shows the correlation of forgiveness with Self-kindness, Self-judgement, Common Humanity, Isolation, Mindfulness, and Over-identification. The table shows a significant positive correlation between forgiveness and Self-judgment ($r = .208$, $p > 0.05$) Common humanity ($r = .249$, $p < 0.01$), Isolation ($r = .250$, $p < 0.01$), Mindfulness ($r = .231$, $p < 0.01$), and Over-identification ($r = .261$, $p < 0.01$). No significant relationship was found between Forgiveness and Self-kindness ($r = .159$, $p > 0.05$).

Table 5: Correlation between subscales of Self-compassion and subscales of Forgiveness.

	Self-kindness	Self-judgment	Common humanity	Isolation	Mindfulness	Over-identification	Forgiveness of self	Forgiveness of others	Forgiveness of situation
Self-kindness	1								
Self-judgment	.206*	1							
Common humanity	.514**	.334**	1						
Isolation	.282**	.558**	.402**	1					
Mindfulness	.357**	.438**	.539**	.448**	1				
Over-identification	.341**	.537**	.466**	.473**	.468**	1			
Forgiveness of self	.121	.072	.247**	.163*	.196*	.256**	1		
Forgiveness of others	.109	.277**	.226**	.231**	.159	.231**	.378**	1	
Forgiveness of situation	.141	.139	.107	.190*	.183*	.122	.419**	.418**	1

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the level 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 5 shows a significant correlation between Forgiveness of self with Common humanity ($r = .247$, $p < 0.01$), Isolation ($r = .163$, $p > 0.05$), Mindfulness ($r = .196$, $p > 0.05$), and Over-identification ($r = .256$, $p < 0.01$). No significant relationship was found between Forgiveness of self with Self-kindness ($r = .121$, $p > 0.05$), and Self-judgement ($r = .072$, $p > 0.05$).

The table also shows a significant relationship between Forgiveness of others with Self-judgment ($r = .277$, $p < 0.01$), Common humanity ($r = .226$, $p < 0.01$), Isolation ($r = .231$, $p < 0.01$), and Over-identification ($r = .231$, $p < 0.01$). Whereas, it shows no significant relationship between Forgiveness of others with Self-kindness ($r = .109$, $p > 0.05$), and Mindfulness ($r = .159$, $p > 0.05$).

Lastly, there can also be seen a significant relationship between Forgiveness of situation with Isolation ($r = .190, p > 0.05$), and Mindfulness ($r = .183, p > 0.05$). No significance is seen in the relationship between Forgiveness of situation with Self-kindness ($r = .141, p > 0.05$), Self-judgment ($r = .139, p > 0.05$), Common humanity ($r = .107, p > 0.05$), and Over-identification ($r = .122, p > 0.05$).

Table 6: Group Statistics

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	sig
FORGIVENESS	Females	73	75.71	10.970	2.001	148	.05*
	Males	77	72.70	7.162			

Table 6 shows the group statistics for forgiveness scores of males and females. The mean value for females was found to be 75.71 (SD = 10.970) and for males the mean value came out to be 72.70 (SD = 7.162). The t-value obtained indicated a significant difference in Forgiveness between males and females, $t(77, 73) = 2.001, p \leq 0.05$. Thus, our fifth hypothesis, “Females will be more forgiving than Males” is accepted.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

The main aim of the study was to understand how Motivational Drives, Self-compassion and Rumination affect Forgiving behaviour. In order to understand this, various questionnaires were administered and the effect of different variables were seen on forgiving behaviour (forgiveness of others, forgiveness of self, and forgiveness of situations) and Self-compassion (self-kindness, self-kindness, self-judgment, common humanity, isolation, mindfulness, over-identification). Motivational drives included revenge and avoidance motivation which helped in understanding how the presence of such motivations affects an individual's tendency to forgive. Correlation and regression analysis was done. It was found that Self-compassion and Rumination had a positive correlation with forgiving behaviour while revenge motivation and avoidance motivation had a negative correlation with forgiving behaviour.

Firstly, it was hypothesized that "Self-compassion will have a positive correlation with Forgiving behaviour" was Accepted. It is logical to conclude, based on Fredrickson's (2000) research, that self-compassion is linked to another positive emotion: forgiveness of others.

Other findings that were also seen in the study were that overall forgiveness had no significance with self-kindness. Findings by Mistler (2010) support the notion that compassion for others and self-compassion go hand-in-hand, a person who is compassionate to others may not be compassionate to one's self. There are people who seem to easily show kindness and forgiveness to others but are critical of themselves. Similarly, another study done by Lamb and Murphy (2012) also pointed out that people who are less forgiving of themselves often feel rejected, lonely and unstable.

The second hypothesis stated that, “Avoidance Motivation will have a negative correlation with Forgiveness” was rejected. No such findings were found to support this hypothesis as past literature indicates that high avoidance motivation is negatively correlated with forgiveness of others (Jiang & Ma, 2020).

The third hypothesis stated that, “Revenge Motivation will have a negative correlation with Forgiveness” was rejected. According to Billingsley and Losin (2017) people sometimes can restrain their instinctive impulses to retaliate or avoid and choose forgiveness as an effective strategy to maintain the relationship.

The next hypothesis, “Rumination will have a negative correlation with forgiveness” was accepted. While many researches have linked forgiveness to physical and mental health, there is only one study that specifically addresses the association between forgiveness and rumination in the literature. A study conducted by McCullough et al. (2001) discovered that people who ruminated less were more forgiving over time, showing a link between rumination and forgiveness.

Lastly, it was hypothesized that, “Females will be more forgiving than males” was also accepted. Generally women are believed to be more forgiving than men, the reason behind it is due to their personality traits such as agreeableness and empathy, and their valuing relationships (Miller et al., 2008). In a meta-analytic review of 70 studies with 15,731 individuals, Miller et al. (2008) found a gender difference in forgiveness with small to moderate effect size, showed greater willingness to forgive among female respondents.

Limitation of the study

When analysing this study, there are several constraints to consider. First, because the sample was selected using convenient sampling, the findings of this study should not be applied to the broader population. Some of the relationships were not found to be significant which is not in line with existing literature, which can be accounted to age differences. Dependence on self-report measures also delimits the study, even though efforts to yield honest responses were made. The other limitation is the sample size. The results would have been better had the sample size been large.

Future Research

Future research among diverse samples is needed to examine the relationship between motivational drives, self-compassion, rumination, and forgiveness. Also, future research could focus on Forgiveness with defence mechanisms or coping styles. The research can further be extended with cross- culture, socio- economic status, religion etc. Attitudinal survey towards forgiveness in relation to socio economic status can also be done.

REFERENCES

1. Barcaccia, B., Schneider, B. H., Pallini, S., and Baiocco, R. (2017). Bullying and the detrimental role of un-forgiveness in adolescents' wellbeing. *Psicothema* 29, 217–222.
2. Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 497-529.
3. Brach, T. (2003). *Radical acceptance: Embracing your life with the heart of a Buddha*. New York: Bantam.
4. Bennett-Goleman, T. (2001). *Emotional alchemy: How the mind can heal the heart*. New York: Three Rivers Press.
5. Billingsley J., Losin E. A. (2017). The neural systems of forgiveness: an evolutionary psychological perspective. *Front. Psychol.* 8:737.
6. Bushman, B. J., Baumeister, R. F., & Phillips, C. M. (2001). Do people aggress to improve their mood? Catharsis beliefs, affect regulation opportunity, and aggressive responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 17-32.
7. Enright, R. D. (1996). Counseling within the forgiveness triad: on forgiving, receiving forgiveness, and self-forgiveness. *Counseling and Values*, 40(2), 107–126
8. Fredrickson, B. L. (1998). What good are positive emotions? *Review of General Psychology*. (2)300-3.
9. Fredrickson, B. L. (2000). Cultivating positive emotions to optimize health and well-being. *Prevention and treatment*.
10. Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden- and-build theory. *American Psychology*. (5). 218-226.
11. Fredrickson, B. L. (2004). The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *Positive Emotions*. 359. 1367-1377.
12. Fincham, F. D., Hall, J., & Beach, S. R. (2006). Forgiveness in marriage: current status and future directions. *Family Relations*, 55(4), 415– 427.
13. Horowitz, M.J., Wilner, N., & Alvarez, W. (1979). Impact of Event Scale: A measure of subjective stress. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 41, 209-218.

14. Kachadourian, L. K., Fincham, F., & Davila, J. (2004). The tendency to forgive in dating and married couples: the role of attachment and relationship satisfaction. *Personal Relationships*, 11(3), 373–393
15. Maslow, A. H. (1968). *Toward a psychology of being*. New York, NY: Van Nostrand.
16. Macaskill, A., Maltby, J., Day, L. (2002). Forgiveness of self and others and emotional empathy. *Journal of Social Psychology*. 142 (5), 166-169.
17. McCullough M. E., Hoyt W. T. (2002). Transgression-related motivational dispositions: personality substrates of forgiveness and their links to the big five. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 28 1556–1573.
18. McCullough, M. E., Pargament, K. I., & Thoresen, C. E. (2000). The psychology of forgiveness: History, conceptual issues, and overview. In M. E. McCullough, K. I. Pargament, & C. E. Thoresen (Eds.), *Forgiveness: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 1-14). New York, NY: Guilford.
19. McCullough ME, Pargament KI, Thoresen CE. The psychology of forgiveness: history, conceptual issues, and overview. In: *the psychology of forgiveness: history, conceptual issues, and overview*. New York: Guilford Press; 2000.
20. Miller, A. J., & Worthington, E. L. (2010). Sex differences in forgiveness and mental health in recently married couples. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 5(1), 12–23.
21. Neff, K. D., & Pommier, E. (2013). The relationship between self-compassion and other-focused concern among college undergraduates, community adults, and practicing meditators. *Self and Identity*, 12(2), 160–176.
22. Neff (2003). Self-compassion: An alternative conceptualization of a healthy attitude toward oneself. *Self and Identity*, Volume 2, Issue 2, Page 85-101.
23. Neff, (2004). Self-compassion and psychological well-being. *Constructivism in the Human Sciences*, Volume 9, Issue 2, Page 27-30.
24. Neff, Pisitsungkagarn, Hsieh, et.al., (2008). Self-compassion and self-construal in the United States, Thailand, and Taiwan. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Volume 39, Issue 3, Page 267-285.
25. Neff, K. D. (2003a). Development and validation of a scale to measure selfcompassion. *Self and Identity*, 2, 223–250.
26. Prama, G. (2013). *Sadness, Happiness, Blissfulness*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
27. Slotter E. B., Finkel E. J., DeWall C. N., Pond R. S., Lambert N. M., Bodenhausen G. V., et al. (2012). Putting the brakes on aggression toward a romantic partner: the executive influence of relationship commitment. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 102 291–305.

28. Rusting, C.L., & Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (1998). Regulating responses to anger: Effects of rumination and distraction on angry mood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 790-803.
29. Voiss JK. Rethinking Christian forgiveness: theological, philosophical, and psychological explorations. Collegeville: Michael Glazier; 2015.
30. Zhang, J., & Chen, S. (2016). Self-compassion promotes personal improvement from regret experiences via acceptance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 42(2), 244–258.

APPENDIX

Appendix A

HEARTLAND FORGIVENESS SCALE

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.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Almost always false of me		More often false of me		More often true of me		Almost always true of me

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.

Appendix B

SELF-COMPASSION SCALE

Please read each statement carefully before answering. For each item, indicate how often you behave in the stated manner, using the following 1-5 scale. Please answer according to what really reflects your experience rather than what you think your experience should be

1	2	3	4	5
Almost never				Almost always

1. I'm disapproving and judgmental about my own flaws and inadequacies.
2. When I'm feeling down I tend to obsess and fixate on everything that's wrong.
3. When things are going badly for me, I see the difficulties as part of life that everyone goes through.
4. When I think about my inadequacies, it tends to make me feel more separate and cut off from the rest of the world.
5. I try to be loving towards myself when I'm feeling emotional pain.
6. When I fail at something important to me I become consumed by feelings of inadequacy.
7. When I'm down, I remind myself that there are lots of other people in the world feeling like I am.
8. When times are really difficult, I tend to be tough on myself.
9. When something upsets me I try to keep my emotions in balance.
10. When I feel inadequate in some way, I try to remind myself that feelings of inadequacy are shared by most people.
11. I'm intolerant and impatient towards those aspects of my personality I don't like.
12. When I'm going through a very hard time, I give myself the caring and tenderness I need.
13. When I'm feeling down, I tend to feel like most other people are probably happier than I am.
14. When something painful happens I try to take a balanced view of the situation.

15. I try to see my failings as part of the human condition
16. When I see aspects of myself that I don't like, I get down on myself.
17. When I fail at something important to me I try to keep things in perspective.
18. When I'm really struggling, I tend to feel like other people must be having an easier time of it.
19. I'm kind to myself when I'm experiencing suffering.
20. When something upsets me I get carried away with my feelings.
21. I can be a bit cold-hearted towards myself when I'm experiencing suffering.
22. When I'm feeling down I try to approach my feelings with curiosity and openness.
23. I'm tolerant of my own flaws and inadequacies.
24. When something painful happens I tend to blow the incident out of proportion.
25. When I fail at something that's important to me, I tend to feel alone in my failure.
26. I try to be understanding and patient towards those aspects of my personality I don't like.

Appendix C

RUMINATION SCALE

People think and do many different things when they feel depressed. Please read each of the items below and indicate whether you almost never, sometimes, often, or almost always think or do each one when you feel down, sad, or depressed. Please indicate what you generally do, not what you think you should do.

1	2	3	4
Almost never	Sometimes	Often	Almost always

1. Think about how alone you feel
2. Think "I won't be able to do my job if I don't snap out of this"
3. Think about your feelings of fatigue and achiness
4. Think about how hard it is to concentrate
5. Think "What am I doing to deserve this?"
6. Think about how passive and unmotivated you feel.
7. Analyze recent events to try to understand why you are depressed
8. Think about how you don't seem to feel anything anymore
9. Think "Why can't I get going?"
10. Think "Why do I always react this way?"
11. Go away by yourself and think about why you feel this way
12. Write down what you are thinking about and analyze it
13. Think about a recent situation, wishing it had gone better
14. Think "I won't be able to concentrate if I keep feeling this way."
15. Think "Why do I have problems other people don't have?"
16. Think "Why can't I handle things better?"
17. Think about how sad you feel.
18. Think about all your shortcomings, failings, faults, mistakes

19. Think about how you don't feel up to doing anything
20. Analyze your personality to try to understand why you are depressed
21. Go someplace alone to think about your feelings
22. Think about how angry you are with yourself

Appendix D

Transgression-Related Interpersonal Motivations Scale--12-Item Form (TRIM-12)

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

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

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