## The Relationship between Different Patterns of Forgiveness and Emotion Regulation Strategies.

山本琢俟(早稲田大学)

キーワード: University student, Forgiveness, Emotion regulation

## Introduction

Thompson & Snyder (2003) defined forgiveness as "the framing of a perceived transgression such that one's attachment to the transgressor, transgression, and sequelae of the transgression is transformed from negative to neutral or positive", and which is consisted of 3 factors: "forgiveness of others", "negative forgiveness of self" and "positive forgiveness of self" in Japan (Ishikawa & Hamaguchi, 2007). Forgiveness has been linked with psychological health and psychological well-being (Thompson et al., 2003). The forgiveness poses an option for repairing and maintaining relationships which serve to nurture and protect people (Denham, Neal, Wilson, Pickering & Boyatzis, 2005).

Yamamoto (2017) investigated the relationships between 3 factors of forgiveness and emotion regulation strategies. However, we have more than a factor of forgiveness usually. This would be supported by Ishikawa et al.'s (2007) study, they indicated moderate correlations among the factors. Therefore, present study investigated some combinations of 3 factors of forgiveness and relationship between different patterns of forgiveness and emotion regulation strategies.

## Participants.

Participants were students at two national universities in the Chugoku district and one private university in the Kanto district of Japan (N = 208, 103 males, 105 females). Measure.

Method

1) Ishikawa et al.'s (2007) the Dispositional Forgiveness Scale (DFS) consisted of 23 items. Respondents used a 4points scale (1 = No to 4 = Yes)

2) Sakakibara's (2015) Japanese-version Cognitive Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (JCERQ) consisted of 36 items. Respondents used a 5-points scale (1 =Never to 5 =Always). Results and Discussion

To identify the different patterns of forgiveness in university students, I conducted cluster analyses using the three factors of forgiveness, forgiveness of others, negative forgiveness of self, and positive forgiveness of self. To confirm the clusters, a hierarchical clustering method was used. Ward's method was chosen and it was decided that the four-cluster solution was more suitable and should be carried





forward for subsequent analyses than others. Figure 1 contains the standardized (Z-score) means on the three factors of forgiveness for the four clusters. I conducted a one-way ANOVA to test for three factors of forgiveness differences. ANOVA for forgiveness of others, F(3, 204) = 105.34, p < .001, negative forgiveness of self, F(3, 204) = 100.31, p < .001, and positive forgiveness of self, F (3, 204) = 13.41, p < .001, were significant. To further describe the clusters, I conducted multiple comparison analysis. Turkey's honestly significant difference test's method was chosen and there were significant differences, forgiveness of others, cluster 1 = cluster 3 > cluster 2 > cluster 4, negative forgiveness of self, cluster 3 > cluster 2 > cluster 1 = cluster 4, and positive forgiveness of self, cluster 1 =cluster 2 =cluster 3 >cluster 4.

To further describe the clusters, I conducted a one-way MANOVA to test for nine factors of JCERQ differences. The results indicated there were significant differences among the clusters on the dependent measures. Table 1 contains the unstandardized means, standard deviations, F-values, and the results of multiple comparison analysis (Turkey's honestly significant difference test's method) on the dependent variables for the four clusters.

Cluster 1 had high scores of "Putting into perspective", "Rumination or focus in thought", and "Catastrophizing". Cluster 2 had high score of "Blaming others", and low score of "self-blame". Cluster 3 had high score of "Positive reappraisal", and low scores of "Rumination or focus in thought", "Putting into perspective" and "Catastrophizing". Cluster 4 had low scores of "Positive reappraisal" and "Acceptance". It was shown the cluster 3 had the lowest score of "Putting into perspective" and this result was in conflict with previous study, "Putting into perspective" was theoretically one of "more adaptive" strategy (Garnefski, Karaaij & Spinhoven, 2001). About "Refocus on planning", there was no significant difference among four clusters. However, it was indicated that the means of "Refocus on planning" had high scores for the four clusters. University students would choice the strategy like "I think of what I can do best" when they experience negative or unpleasant events regardless of their forgiveness combinations.

Table 1	Results of one-way	ANOVA to test	for JCERC	differences

	Cluster 1 M(SD) n = 41	Cluster 2 M(SD) n = 71	Cluster 3 M(SD) n = 47	Cluster 4 M (SD) n = 49	F value	Multiple comparisor analysis
Positive reappraisal	3.74 (0.76)	3.78 (0.72)	3.99 (0.85)	3.26 (0.96)	7.10 ***	1 = 2 = 3 > 4
Putting into perspective	2.91 (0.64)	2.72 (0.70)	2.33 (0.77)	2.73 (0.71)	5.44 **	1 = 2 = 4 > 3
Acceptance	4.28 (0.62)	4.11 (0.56)	4.25 (0.66)	3.89 (0.84)	3.31 *	1 = 3 > 4
tumination or focus in thought	3.99 (0.82)	3.34 (0.82)	3.07 (0.87)	3.74 (0.79)	11.47 ***	1 = 4 > 2 = 3
Catastrophizing	3.38 (0.94)	2.74 (0.93)	2.20 (0.78)	3.27 (1.04)	15.73 ***	1 > 4 > 2 > 3
Blaming others	2.29 (0.85)	2.84 (0.83)	2.43 (0.89)	2.54 (0.91)	4.12 **	2 > 1
Self-blame	4.03 (0.60)	3.33 (0.76)	3.40 (0.70)	3.76 (0.67)	10.98 ***	1 = 4 > 2 = 3
Refocus on planning	4.29 (0.47)	4.26 (0.59)	4.34 (0.60)	4.16 (0.76)	0.71 n.s.	
Positive refocusing	2.89 (0.75)	3.01 (0.88)	3.10 (0.81)	2.69 (1.04)	1.98 n.s.	

\* p < .05 \*\* p < .01 \*\*\* p < .001