

Changing the Angle:
The Effect of Group Membership and Apology
on the Willingness to Take Perspective of
Ex-prisoners

Lisa Schrimpf

s1126164

Bachelor Thesis

July 2013

University of Twente

Faculty of Behavioral Science

Psychology

First Advisor: Dr. Sven Zebel

Second Advisor : Dr. Ir. Peter W. de Vries

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

Content

Abstract.....	3
Samenvatting.....	4
Introduction.....	5
Method	11
Design	11
Participants.....	12
Procedure	12
Independent variables	12
Dependent variables.....	14
Results.....	16
Covariates	16
Manipulation checks	16
Discussion and Conclusion	23
References.....	28
Appendix.....	33

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

Abstract

The stigmatization of ex-prisoners can complicate their reintegration into society because they perceive themselves as not being part of it. This perceived exclusion might lead to a higher risk of recidivism. Perspective taking is argued to counteract stigmatization as people are encouraged to find similarities between themselves and the other person. This study aims to focus on the effect of group membership of an ex-prisoner and on the effect of apologizing on the willingness to take the perspective of this ex-prisoner. It is suggested that people are more willing to take an ex-prisoner's perspective when he is part of the out-group compared to being part of the in-group because of the "black sheep effect". This effect states that in-group members are judged more harshly as the positive image of the whole group is affected and therefore the group needs to distance itself from the "black sheep". Apologizing is expected to increase the willingness to take perspective of an ex-prisoner because it restores the positive image of an ex-prisoner. The "black sheep effect" is expected to hold true for the interaction effect as being part of the out-group and apologizing leads to a higher willingness to take perspective compared to an ex-prisoner who is part of the in-group and apologizes. The same tendency is expected to apply if no apology is given although the effect will be less clear. In this online survey 207 participants were asked to take perspective of either an in- or an out-group ex-prisoner who apologized or not. Overall, the main effects as well as the interaction effects turned out to be less strong than expected. Although most of the effects were not found to be significant, the tendencies emphasized the hypothesis stated except in the case of membership. Here the opposite result was found which can be explained using the ultimate attribution error (Pettigrew, 1979) which suggests that negative attributions of in-group members are ascribed to the situation rather than to dispositional factors. Further research need to be carried out in order to underline the results. Implicates are discussed.

Samenvatting

Ex-gevangene worden vaak geconfronteerd met labeling als ze terugkeren in de maatschappij omdat ze nog steeds als criminele gezien worden. Dit is ondanks dat ze hun straf hebben uitgezeten. Deze vorm van stigmatisatie maakt re-integratie moeilijk en kan leiden tot recidive. Dit onderzoek is gefocust op het effect van groepslidmaatschap en een excuus op het perspectiefname van een ex-gevangene. Perspectiefname leidt tot het vinden van overeenkomsten tussen deze twee personen en dit leidt tot een hoger mate van sympathie. Er wordt aangenomen dat mensen eerder geneigd zijn het perspectief van een ex-gevangene te nemen als die geen lid zijn van de ingroep. Dit wordt door het "black sheep effect" verklaart. Als een ex-gevangene een excuus maakt zou de bereidheid om perspectief te nemen hoger zijn als een ex-gevangene die ervan afziet. Het "black sheep effect" zou ook moeten zorgen voor een interactie-effect: outgroup ex-gevangene die een excuus maken worden positiever beoordeeld dan ingroup ex-gevangene. Dit effect wordt ook gevonden als er geen excuus wordt gemaakt maar minder duidelijk. In het algemeen zijn de verwachte verbanden minder sterk dan aangenomen. Er is alleen sprake van neigingen die de hypothesen ondersteunen maar niet significant bevestigen. Groepslidmaatschap laat zelfs de omgekeerd effect zien dat door de ultieme attributie fout verklaard kan worden (Pettigrew, 1979). Dit betekent dat negatief gedrag van de ingroup door situationele factoren verklaart wordt, terwijl het negatief gedrag van de outgroup op dispositionele factoren gebaseerd. Verder onderzoek moet worden ondernomen om de gevonden effecten na te gaan. Implicaties worden besproken.

Introduction

In Insel, a German town, people demonstrated against two sex offenders who moved to their town after they were discharged out of prison. People worried about the safety of their families and especially their children. The citizens protested against them with banners saying “We are not an island for criminals”. Of course sexual and violent criminals appear to evoke strong reactions. But reintegration of ex-prisoners is a necessary step for them in order to establish a normal life and refrain from re-offending. However, especially the label of being criminal influences the way they are perceived by society. Lissenberg, van Ruller and van Swaaningen (2001) argued that criminals who are permanently confronted with suspicion and a lack of respect will lose their trust in society as well as their respect towards communal life. Such processes are argued to increase the likelihood of recidivism.

This spiral effect could also be explained by using social interactionism which suggests that our identity is constructed by how other people perceive us. Especially people who do not have such a high self-regard (including ex-prisoners) tend to be subject to labels of others. In turn this again might have influence on their success of integration. Tannenbaum (1938) stated that people who once were labelled as ‘criminal’ will have difficulties to cast off that label as people tend to pay less attention to the actual offence and its background. Instead they focus on the suspected inner negative intentions of the ex-prisoner and overemphasize their criminal nature. So the way in which the environment perceives an ex-prisoner seems to be one indication for how important their integration into society can be in order to step out of this spiral effect and prevent recidivism.

However, in the more specific context of victim-offender mediation, apologizing seems to have a positive effect on the relation between victim and offender. Umbreit, Coates, and Roberts (2001) suggested that victims find symbolic reparations in from of an apology as important as monetary reparation in the restorative justice process. The offender shows responsibility for his offence which can lead to restoring the relationship between the victim and the offender as well as to repairing the harm caused (United Nations Office for Drugs and Crime, 2006).

In a more general sense, society seems to face difficulties when it comes to obey an undistorted, truthful and fair perception of an ex-prisoner. The question arises

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

what factors can affect the image of an ex-prisoner and therefore a successful reintegration or at least an acceptance of an ex-prisoner by his social environment. So which factors could lead to encourage people and increase their willingness to take perspective of an ex-prisoner? Does it make a difference whether someone apologizes for his offence? Or are there certain characteristics which influence their willingness to take perspective, e.g. his group membership? The following research question was formulated:

To what extent does the willingness to take perspective of an ex-prisoner depend on him having apologized and his group membership?

The influence of an apology on the perception of ex-prisoners

Davis and Gold (2011) described an apology as a mechanism which aims to preserve an interpersonal or inter-group relation by resolving a social transgression. Enright, Gassin and Wu (1992) found that resolving a transgression and therefore enhancing forgiveness entails that the violated party will distance itself from negative feelings such as revenge or retaliation. So people who are willing to apologize for their transgression will experience a higher level of forgiveness from their environment than those who did not (Excline & Baumeister, 2000; Hodgins and Liebeskind, 2003).

There are attributions which can function as a sort of catalyst and increase the effect of an apology on forgiveness. Gold and Weiner (2000) ascribed remorse such a function. So remorse entails that the transgressor obtains negative feelings as a consequence of his violating behavior (Brooks and Reddon, 2003). Also the level of perceived remorse seems to play a role. Darby and Schlenker (1982) concluded that the higher the level of perceived remorse, the more effective an apology will be in reducing negative feelings towards the transgressor. This finding can also be applied to offender's apologies. Proeve and Howells (2006) compared the sentencing of offenders who remorsefully apologized and those who omitted to include remorse in their apology. They discovered that the inclusion of remorse led generally to a lighter sentencing by mock jurors.

There are supposed to be two routes which aim to explain the correlation between remorse and forgiveness. One the hand, the empathy model entails that remorse in form of an apology stimulates a victim's empathy towards the offender

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

(McCullough et al. 1997). In turn this empathy will then lead to forgiveness (McCullough et al. 1998). They also stated that empathy debilitates negative responses towards the transgressor, e.g. avoidance or revenge. The perceived empathy obeys also an important function of reconstructing someone's image as a respectable person. Empathy encourages victims to take a second glance at what happened to the offender and realizes that humans might make mistakes (McCullough et al., 1997, 1998; Exline, Worthington, Hill, & McCullough, 2003; Takaku, 2001).

Besides empathy, the attribution of stability is argued to be another mediator between remorse and forgiveness. It is based upon attribution theory which claims that a remorseful apology is able to modify the perceived attributions of a transgressor (Weiner et al., 1991). The attribution entails the stability of a behavior which influences the perceived or assumed cause of the offence (Gold & Davis, 2005). So offenders, who apologize, minimize attributions of stability as they are showing responsibility for their action by respecting social norms and rules and maintain respect for those norms in the future (Weiner, 1989). In other words, an apology leads to the idea that criminals are less likely to re-offend because of their minimized their attributions of stability and this will lead to an increase in forgiveness (Gold & Weiner, 2000).

Furthermore, Davis and Gold (2011) found that the attribution theory as well as the empathy model can be integrated. The attribution theory suggests that remorse affects forgiveness via the behavioral stability as a mediator. This mechanism was expanded by empathy which functions as a link between stability and forgiveness. So if it is believed that someone does not re-offend, it will have a positive effect on empathy and well as on forgiveness.

Remorse, empathy as well as behavioural stability can reinforce forgiveness. Moreover, remorse as well as empathy can be intensified or affected through other attributions. Proeve and Howells (2006) found that shame and the perceived remorse of an offender have a similar effect in an apology. It does not seem to make a difference which of those two is included as criminal offenders were accepted to a similar degree. Suffering as an extension of remorse also appears to have an influence on people's reactions to apologies. Frank (1988), an economist, underlined this by arguing that people who apologize remorsefully are accepted to a higher degree by

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

their environment than people who abandon an apology. This appears to be the case because people, who show remorse and seem to suffer from their negative behaviour, are less likely to show recidivism in the long run. Also Darley, Carlsmith and Robinson (2000, 2002) pointed at people's desire for retribution which can be counteracted through a person suffers from remorse. So suffering intensifies remorse. Robbenolt (2003) found that taking responsibility and expressing empathy has a larger positive effect in an apology than only showing empathy. Expressing responsibility would enhance the effect of an apology among its recipients. Therefore, it appears to be equally important that empathy is shown by the transgressor and perceived by the victim in form of an apology.

The role of group membership in the perception of ex-prisoners

An offender's apology can enhance the social perception of his image as more respectable person (Darby and Schlenker, 1982). The way someone is perceived can also be influenced by his group membership. Kassin, Fein and Markus (2008) described those two categories. People socially categorize others as being part of an out-group based on their different norms and believes or as being part of their in-group as they share certain values. There appear to be different criteria on which a membership is created, e.g. nationality, religion, political believes.

Group membership does not only obtain the function of categorizing. It can also be used to explain differences in judging someone's transgression. Tajfel and Turner's social identity theory (1979, 1986) suggested that in-group members generally try to differentiate from the out-group through enforcing the positive image of their group. Consequently, the members exaggerate their own group values as superior to the out-group which aims at highlighting the differences between the two groups (Castano, Yzerbyt, Paladino & Sacchi, 2002). Bijvank (2012) and Brink (2012) extend this theory as people are less willing to take the perspective of in-group members who did something wrong compared to out-group members with identical wrongdoing. In this case it refers to obtaining a criminal record. In order to ensure the positive image of their group, the so called "black-sheep-effect" occurs. This effect describes that being part of the in-group is not an unconditional privilege, but rather uncompromising when it comes to offending their rules (Marques, Yzerbyt & Leynes, 1988). Social identity theory (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) argues that in-

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

group members define themselves partly in terms of their own group. That is the reason why they aim to sustain a positive image of the group as a whole. It appears to be a threat to the in-group if a member harms their image and therefore their social identity. Marques et al. (1988) state that poor performances of in-group members are judged more negatively compared to the same performance of out-group members. In order to hold on to their superior identity and to solidify their group's positive image, the in-group distances itself from its own members who did not act according to their beliefs and rules. Those excluded in-group members are called "black-sheep".

Group membership also interacts with the perception of apologies. Giner-Sorolla, Espinosa, Castano, and Brown (2008) looked at responses to an apology made by either an in- or an out-group member. It was found that the expression of shame as well as offering reparation weakens only the insult if the apology was made by an out-group member. It did not have any effect for in-group members. On the other hand, several studies (Leach, Spears, Branscombe, & Doosje, 2003; van Dijk, Ouwerkerk, Goslinga, Nieweg, & Gallucci, 2006) found that the out-group's suffering leads to a greater level of satisfaction, i.e. "Schadenfreude". Harth, Horsey and Barlow (2011) focused on intergroup conflicts in terms of forgiveness. Apologies seem stimulate the other group's perception of remorse. However, an apology of the out-group as a whole did not lead to a higher level of forgiveness. Interestingly, individuals of the out-group who stated an apology for intergroup conflicts were personally forgiven more often than those you did not. They argue that this is because the out-group's apology history is less accurate remembered.

The impact of taking perspective of an ex-prisoner

So far an apology as well as the group membership seem to affect the way someone is perceived. The next step aims to explore the effect of changing the perspective of this perception. In other words, it will be looked at the willingness of taking the perspective of an ex-prisoner which entails to project potential thoughts and feelings of an ex-prisoner.

There appear to be several mechanisms which explain how perspective taking influences someone's judgement and opinion. Zebel, Doosje, Spears and Vliek (2010) stated that taking the perspective of an ex-prisoner could offer an opportunity to explain his offence. This thought processes also enhances to find similarities between

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

that person and oneself (Galinsky, Ku and Wang, 2005). This in turn influences the way that other person is described positively and increases sympathy towards the other person as well. Taking perspective asks for the investment of time in thinking about the prisoner. Then situational factors weigh more than they did before and dispositional ones become relatively less prevalent.

Nevertheless, there are barriers that might be faced when it comes to ex-prisoners. According to Baumeister (1997), people are more inclined by nature to feel sympathy for the victim and therefore more readily take the perspective of a victim. A request to take the perspective of an offender and in this case an ex-prisoner might result in a relatively low willingness to take perspective.

But taking the perspective of an ex-prisoner might offer a chance to change that natural manner described by Baumeister (1997). People tend to judge offenders and their offence harshly (Miller, Gordon & Buddie, 1999). However, as people were asked to give explicit explanations for the offence which thus asked them to take the perspective of an offender, people judged the offender less harshly than they did previously. This can be explained as formulating an explanation leads to enhancing the idea that the offence happens actually quite frequently. People experience the offence as less threatening and judge the offender's image as more positive.

However, this seems to be the case if people do not have any relation to this offender. In addition, Hirschfield and Piquero (2010) found that people who are frequently confronted with ex-prisoners tend to rate them as less dangerous or threatening than people who do not have any contact. So taking perspective could build up on that finding as people are asked to deal and get in touch with the story of an ex-prisoner and thus they spent more time on it than they might normally.

Hypotheses

This study examines whether an apology given by an ex-prisoner and his membership influences people's willingness to take perspective of that ex-prisoner.

Hypothesis 1: It is expected that people are more willing to take the perspective of an ex-prisoner who is not a member of their own in-group (i.e. main effect of group membership on perspective taking).

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

This hypothesis is based on the assumption that ex-prisoners who are part of the in-group are judged more harshly than those of an out-group because people want to distance themselves from in-group members who violated their rules and beliefs (“black-sheep-effect”). Thus, they are relatively more tolerant towards out-group ex-prisoners because they pose no threat to the image of their group.

Hypothesis 2: An ex-prisoner’s apology increases people’s willingness to take his perspective (i.e. main effect of apologizing on perspective taking).

The second hypothesis is based on the assumption that an apology can restore the image of the ex-prisoner because people then perceive the offence as less unusual and judge the ex-prisoner as less threatening. This in turn leads to a more positive perception of the ex-prisoner as it would weaken the restraint to the label of being a criminal.

Hypothesis 3: There is an interaction-effect between the membership of the ex-prisoner and giving an apology. The main effect of group membership of an ex-prisoner is reinforced by his apology.

It is expected that the hypothesized effects of an apology turn out to be stronger in the case of an out-group ex-prisoner compared to an in-group ex-prisoner. Again, the “black-sheep-effect” could apply. Participants who read about an out-group member who gives an apology are expected to receive a higher willingness to take his perspective than in-group member who states an apology. This difference in willingness is smaller when no apology is given as there was no attempt to re-establish the ex-prisoner’s image

Method

Design

This experiment is constructed as a 2 (membership of the ex-prisoner: in- vs. out-group) x 2 (apology by the ex-prisoner: Yes vs. No) between-participant design. Both the membership of the ex-prisoner and apologizing or not were between subject factors. The participants were asked in all of the conditions to take the perspective of the ex-prisoner. They were randomly assigned to one of the conditions via theistools. The participants were debriefed at the end of the questionnaire (Appendix A).

Participants

Those were contacted via email or via the social media website “Facebook”. All of them were sent a link to the survey. They were also asked to the link to friend who might also be willing to fill in the questionnaire. Participation was completely voluntary and without receiving any kind of reward.

A total of 266 people participated in this online study. 59 (22%) participants across all of the four conditions had to be excluded from this study as they failed to meet one of three criteria. They either filled in less than 50 percent of the items, or were not German and thus were not part of the in-group. Nearly all of the excluded participants ($n = 58$) were removed because of the first criteria as they generally dropped out after they took perspective. Only one participant failed to meet the second criteria. The final sample consisted of 207 participants (127 men, 71 female, 9 n/s), ranging in age from 19 to 66 years ($M = 43.23$, $SD = 12.64$). The academic achievements of the participants ranged from secondary modern school qualification (“Hauptschulabschluss”) to University degree (5.8% of the participants had a secondary modern school qualification “Hauptschulabschluss”, 15.9 % a middle school “Realschulabschluss”, 19.8% academic high school “Abitur”, 1.4% comprehensive school vocational education “Gesamtschulabschluss”, 10.4 % vocational education “Berufschulabschluss”, 30.0% University degree, others 10.6%, n/s 2.9%). Also 33.8% of the participants were victims of a criminal offence for at least once during their lifetime and 46.0% knew someone who was. On the other hand 3.5% admitted that they once committed a crime and 27.5% stated they knew someone who did.

Procedure

Independent variables

National identification. The participants were asked to indicate to what extent they were able to identify with being German. This was used in order to prime them as being part of that nationality as this was supposed to represent the in-group. The questions were taken from Leach et al. (2008) and translated into German. Overall, there were 14 items which were answered using a Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly disagree) (Appendix B). In order to underline the five different aspects of national identification found by Leah et al. (2008), those five

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

scales were also used during this study. Integration those aspects lead also two five reliable scales: solidarity (three items; e.g. “Ich fühle gegenüber Deutschen solidarisch.”; $\alpha = .828$), satisfaction (four items; e.g. Ich bin froh, Deutsche(r) zu sein.”; $\alpha = .871$), centrality (three items, e.g. „Deutsche(r) zu sein macht einen großen Anteil aus von dem was ich bin.“; $\alpha = .858$), individual self-stereotyping (two items, e.g. “Ich habe viel mit dem durchschnittlichen Deutschen gemein.“; $r(207) = .78$ and in-group homogeneity (two items, e.g. „Ich ähnele dem durchschnittlichen Deutschen sehr.“, $r(207) = .81$ (Appendix B). As part of the demographical variables it was checked whether all participants were German and therefore part of the in-group.

Instruction of perspective taking. Before the participants had to read the ex-prisoner’s fictitious statement, they were asked to take his perspective during their reading. Then, they were told that after reading it they will be asked to write down two thoughts which they had experiences during that process. That was followed by writing down two emotions that they felt at that time (Appendix D). Those instructions were taken from an earlier experiment by Zebel, Doosje, Spears en Vliek (2010) and used to encourage the participants to actually take the perspective.

Manipulation of ex-prisoners group membership. After the participants were primed in terms of their membership, there were asked to read a fictitious interview of an ex-prisoner who talks about his problems finding a job and his concerns about his future outside the prison (Appendix D). The participants were told that this interview was part of a television documentary. This was the same within all conditions.

However, the statement of the ex-prisoner was manipulated in term of his nationality. One half of the participant received a statement of an ex-prisoner who was part of their in-group. Thus it was a German ex-prisoner named Martin, 26 years old. The other half received a statement of a Peruvian ex-prisoner (Paulo, 26) who represented the out-group. It was chosen for someone with Peruvian origin because of his different culture and its neutral/non-liable status in Germany.

Manipulation of apologizing. Depending on the condition, the ex-prisoner apologized or not. The apology included the following five elements: empathy/sympathy towards his victim, shame about his offence, responsibility of his action, remorse as well as a suffering (Appendix E).

Dependent variables

Willingness of perspective taking. The participants were asked to evaluate how the task of perspective taking was perceived. Again, those eleven items were taken from the same experiment (Zebel et al., 2010). An example would be “Inwieweit haben Sie versucht, Martins Perspektive einzunehmen?“ or “Ich fand, dass der Ex-Straftäter es nicht wert war, dass ich mich in ihn hineinversetze.“. These question and statements were all constructed as Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly disagree).

An explorative factor analysis (extraction method: principal axis factoring, varimax rotation; value > 1) was applied to the construct of taking perspective and resulted in three factors (explaining 43.85 % of variance). The first scale was made up of five items which were summarized to determine the *fear of feeling sympathy and understanding* towards the ex-prisoner ($\alpha = .856$), e.g. “Ich hatte Angst, dass wenn ich mich zu sehr in den Ex-Straftäter hineinversetze, zu viel Sympathie für ihn zu empfinden.“. The second scale involved three items which implied the *degree to which the perspective was taken* ($\alpha = .875$), e.g. “Inwieweit war es Ihnen möglich, seine Perspektive einzunehmen?“. The third scale emphasized the *resistance towards taking perspective* of an ex-prisoner ($\alpha = .740$) and included three items, e.g. “Inwieweit hatten Sie Schwierigkeiten, Martins Perspektive einzunehmen?“ (Appendix F). To check this manipulation, thoughts and emotions were coded (Appendix G).

The following two scales measured the consequences of taking the perspective of an ex-prisoner to determine whether their function of restoring the ex-prisoner’s image was achieved.

Rating the ex-prisoner. At first, the participants had to rate the ex-prisoner in order to determine how they rated the ex-prisoner after they had to take their perspective. This included whether they perceived the ex-prisoner as being trustworthy, e.g. “To what extent do you think the ex-prisoner’s statements are trustworthy?“ Other constructs concerned the level of remorse perceived by the ex-prisoner, the level of motivation to renounce criminal acts and the chance of recidivism. That scale was constructed out of different experiments by Weimer, Graham, Peter, and Zmuidinaus (1991). Again, a Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

disagree) was used. Because not all items of this study were selected, an explorative factor analysis (extraction method: principal axis factoring, varimax rotation; value > 1) was applied. It led to two factors in order to measure the participants' judgment of the ex-prisoner (explaining 54.65% of variance). The first scale was made up of three items and was used to determine the *credibility* of the ex-prisoner ($\alpha = .962$). e.g. "Inwieweit empfinden Sie Martins Aussagen als glaubwürdig?". The second scale obtained five items which defined the perceived *intentions and motivation* of the ex-prisoner ($\alpha = .839$), e.g. "Inwieweit denken Sie, dass Martin motiviert ist, sein straftätiges Verhalten in Zukunft zu vermeiden?" (Appendix H).

Opinion about ex-prisoner. The second scale was introduced to measure participants' opinion over the ex-prisoner (Leah et al., 2008). It was made up of six items and the participant was asked to state his meaning in terms of rating the ex-prisoner on a Likert scale constructed out of contrasts, e.g. ranging from "cold"(1) to "warm"(7). An explorative factor analysis (extraction method: principal axis factoring, varimax rotation; value > 1) (explaining 65.37% of variance) found one factor, i.e. *opinion* of the ex-prisoner ($\alpha = .839$) (Appendix I).

Social Distance¹ Towards Ex-prisoner. The items were originated from a research assignment of mine and used in order to measure the social distance towards the ex-prisoner. A Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly disagree) was used. Because it is not an established scale, an explorative factor analysis (extraction method: principal axis factoring, varimax rotation; value > 1) was applied (explaining 44.90% of variance). Two factors were found, each of them was made up of three items. The first scale was restricted to the social distance concerning the *direct environment* of the participant ($\alpha = .946$), e.g. "Ich kann mir vorstellen, dass ich eine(n) Ex-Straftäter/-in wie Martin heiraten würde, und dass er/sie zu einem Teil meiner Familie würde.". Therefore, the second scale stated the social distance

¹ This construct was added to establish a potential link between this current study and one I made last year. It was found that social distance as a component of attitude functions as some sort of preventive behavior. The higher the social distance maintained towards ex-offenders, the higher was the level of fear towards becoming a victim of criminal offence.

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

concerning the *indirect environment* ($\alpha = .825$), e.g. “Ich bin der Meinung, dass ausländische Ex-Straftäter mit einer ähnlichen Geschichte wie Martin ohne gültigen deutschen Pass in ihr Herkunftsland verwiesen werden müssen.“ (Appendix J).

Results

Covariates

A Chi-Square test was carried out to determine whether the distribution of men and women were significantly different in the conditions. There was no significant difference found, $\chi^2(6) = 6.61$, *ns*, which means that there was no significant difference in the distribution of gender over the conditions. However, gender was treated as covariate in order to control any effect that the same or the opposite sex of the ex-prisoner’s gender could have on the participant in all of the conditions. So even if the distribution was not significantly different, women might still have reacted different to a male ex-prisoner than men might have and that would be independent of the condition.

A variance analysis was used to determine whether age was distributed equally over the four conditions. There was no significant difference found over all of the conditions, $F_s(1, 191) < 1.6$, *ns*. Nevertheless, age was treated as a covariate for the same reason that gender does. The ex-prisoners profile in terms of age and gender could be either similar or contrary to the participant’s one which could have effect the survey. Furthermore, a variance analysis (ANOVA’s) was conducted to determine whether the membership of the in- or out-group and apologizing or not had a significant effect on taking the perspective of the ex-prisoner. Group membership and apology were treated as fixed factors, whereas age and gender as covariates.

Manipulation checks

Membership group. To ensure that all participants were part of the in-group, they were asked to indicate their nationality. Beside one participant, all of them claimed to be German.

Effect apology.

In order to see whether the apology met its requirements, it was asked for five components at the end of the questionnaire and whether the participant had perceived them or not. The responsibility taken for the offence as well as the suffering of the ex-prisoner was based on items of several studies by Giner-Sorolla et. al (2013).

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

Responsibility was measured using a Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly disagree) was used, e.g. “Inwieweit glauben Sie, dass Martin sich für seine Tat verantwortlich zeigt?”. All of the for items load on one factor (extraction method: principal axis factoring, varimax rotation; value > 1) which explaining 34.28% of the variance and had a reliability of $\alpha = .873$. The first factor was described as *suffering emotional towards victim*, $r(201) = .44$. which could be interpreted as a moderate correlation. An example would be: “Inwieweit zeigt Martins Aussage, dass dieser Ex-Straftäter emotional unter dem verursachten Schaden gegenüber dem Opfer leidet?”.

The second factor indicated *suffering concerning offence* and also contained two items, e.g. “Inwieweit bleibt der Ex-Straftäter ungerührt, wenn er über seine Straftat redet?”. The correlation turned out to be strong, $r(201) = .69$.

The next component measured was the *empathy* of the participants towards the ex-prisoner. Two of the items were taken from a study by Davis and Gold (2010) and two from a study by Zebel et al. (2009). A factor-analysis was carried out (extraction method: principal axis factoring, varimax rotation; value > 1 ; explaining 21.14% of variance) and resulted in one scale, e.g. “Wie viel Empathie haben Sie Martin gegenüber empfunden, nachdem Sie die Aussage gelesen haben?” ($\alpha = .868$). This study was also used to as fundament measure the level of remorse, e.g. “Wie viel Reue hat Martin/Paulo während seiner Aussage gezeigt?”. Again, a factor analysis (extraction method: principal axis factoring, varimax rotation; value > 1) was used which explained 83.96% of the variance. All of the three items loaded on the factor *remorse* ($\alpha = .903$).

The last component was constructed to measure the perceived stability of the ex-prisoner, i.e. the less stable in behaviour the higher the unlikeliness to commit crime. Those items were also based on the study by Davis and Gold (2010). An factoranalysis (extraction method: principal axis factoring, varimax rotation; value > 1 ; explaining 63.29% of variance) lead to the construction of two factors, consisting of two factors each. The first factor was summarized to measure the *success of changing*, $r(201) = .804$, and the second factor emphasised the *probability to change*, $r(201) = .812$. Both factors could be claimed to obtain a strong correlation within their items.

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

The next step aimed to show whether the apology condition affected the seven scales which included the components of an apology. By comparing the means, it already seemed that participants who were given an apology of an ex-prisoner, also scored higher on the seven components.

A multivariate analyse of covariance (MANOCVA) with *group membership* (in vs. out) and *apologizing* (Yes vs. No) as independent variables, *responsibility*, *suffering emotional towards victim*, *suffering concerning offence*, *empathy*, *success of changing*, *probability of changing* and *remorse* as dependent variables was applied. *Gender* and *age* were conducted as covariates.

The MANCOVA manifested a non-significant effect of *gender*, $F(7, 183) = .88$, *ns*, and *age*, $F(7, 183) = 1.00$, *ns*. Because the covariates did not reveal an effect they were excluded from further analyses. The independent variables showed an effect on the dependent variables across the conditions. The interaction between *group membership* and *apologizing* was also significant (Table 1).

Table 1. *MANOVA Results Components of Apology*

Variable	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Group membership	7	7.79	.00
Apologizing	7	22.97	.00
Group membership x Apologizing	7	3.35	.00
Error	183		

The univariate analysis was used to examine the effects found above (Appendix M). Accordingly, both covariates were removed from this analysis. The two main effects were included and so was the interaction effect. Means (M) and standard deviations (SD) were summarized in Table 2.

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations of Dependent Variables as Function of Group Membership and Apologizing

Apology	Member-ship	Respon- sibility			Suffering Emotional			Suffering Offence			Empathy			Success Changing			Probability Changing			Remorse		
		M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Yes	In- group	5.28	1.10	46	4.96	1.37	46	5.23	1.14	46	3.82	1.17	46	3.66	1.14	46	3.59	1.07	46	4.87	1.00	46
	Out- group	5.61	1.14	46	5.13	1.38	46	5.58	1.17	46	4.01	1.31	46	4.67	1.01	46	3.30	1.46	46	5.11	1.34	46
	Total	5.45	1.13	92	5.04	1.36	92	5.40	1.16	92	3.91	1.24	92	4.17	1.18	92	3.45	1.28	92	4.99	1.18	92
No	In- group	3.75	1.06	59	3.12	1.52	59	4.16	1.40	59	3.04	1.14	59	4.46	1.13	59	4.04	1.38	59	3.47	1.17	59
	Out- group	3.83	1.04	44	2.86	1.37	44	4.33	1.42	44	3.35	1.15	44	4.75	1.16	44	4.31	1.28	44	3.39	1.19	44
	Total	3.78	1.04	103	3.01	1.47	103	4.23	1.40	103	3.17	1.15	103	4.58	1.15	103	4.16	1.24	103	3.44	1.17	103
Total	In- group	4.42	1.32	105	3.92	1.72	105	4.63	1.39	105	3.38	1.21	105	4.12	1.19	105	3.84	1.17	105	4.09	1.30	105
	Out- group	4.74	1.40	90	4.02	1.78	90	4.97	1.43	90	3.68	1.27	90	4.71	1.08	90	3.79	1.46	90	4.27	1.53	90
	Total	4.57	1.36	195	3.97	1.74	195	4.78	1.42	195	3.52	1.25	195	4.39	1.18	195	3.82	1.36	195	4.17	1.40	195

Responsibility. Analysis of covariance showed no significant main effect of group membership but one of apologizing. So participants of the apology condition ($M = 5.45$; $SD = 1.13$) scored higher on *responsibility* than participants of the no-apology condition ($M = 3.78$, $SD = 1.04$).

Suffering emotional towards Victim. . Analysis of covariance showed no significant main effect of group membership but one of apologizing. So participants of the apology condition ($M = 5.04$; $SD = 1.36$) scored higher on *suffering emotional* than participants of the no-apology condition ($M = 3.01$, $SD = 1.47$).

Suffering concerning offence. Analysis of covariance showed no significant main effect of group membership but one of apologizing. So participants of the apology condition ($M = 5.40$; $SD = 1.16$) scored higher on *suffering concerning offence* than participants of the no-apology condition ($M = 4.23$, $SD = 1.40$).

Empathy. Analysis of covariance showed no significant main effect of group membership but one for apologizing. So participants of the apology condition ($M = 3.91$; $SD = 1.24$) scored higher on *empathy* than participants of the no-apology condition ($M = 3.19$, $SD = 1.15$).

Success of changing. Analysis of covariance showed a significant main effect of group membership as well as of apologizing. So participants of the apology condition ($M = 4.17$; $SD = 1.18$) scored lower on *success of changing* than participants of the no-apology condition ($M = 4.58$, $SD = 1.15$). As *success of changing* was a component of stability, the lower the mean the less stable the ex-prisoner. The in-group ex-prisoner behaviour was perceived as less stable ($M = 4.12$, $SD = 1.19$) than the behaviour of the out-group member ($M = 4.71$, $SD = 1.08$). This suggested that people assumed that in-group ex-prisoners were less likely to re-offend. There was also an interaction effect between membership and *success of changing*. An in-group ex-prisoner was perceived to be less stable in the apology condition ($M = 3.66$, $SD = 1.01$) compared to an out-group ex-prisoner who apologized ($M = 4.67$, $SD = 1.13$). An in-group ex-prisoner scored also lower on *success of changing* in the no-apology condition ($M = 4.46$, $SD = 1.13$) compared to an out-group ex-prisoner who did not apologize ($M = 4.75$, $SD = 1.16$).

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

Willingness to take perspective. 94.2% of the participants wrote down at least one and 91.8% two thoughts during taking the perspective. One feeling was written down by 91.8% of the participants and 87.9 % mentioned two feelings. Overall, the majority was willing to take the perspective of an ex-prisoner.

Testing of hypotheses

A two-factor univariate covariance analysis was used to test the first hypothesis. It was concluded that there was one significant main effect of membership on one of the three scales of perspective taking, i.e. *resistance towards taking perspective*, $F(1,189) = 4.22, p = .041$. People were less resistance to take perspective of an in-group ex-prisoner ($M = 3.93, SD = 0.13$) compared to the willingness of taking perspective of an out-group ex-prisoner ($M = 3.59, SD = 0.14$). This was the opposite effect of the one expected. The other two scales did not show a significant main effect: $F(1,189) = 0.40, ns$; $F(1,189) = 2.73, ns$). Interestingly, the *degree* to which perspective was taken displayed the tendency which was expected. People were more willing to take perspective of an out-group prisoner ($M = 4.74, SD = 0.12$) compared to one of the in-group ($M = 4.48, SD = 0.11$). The first hypothesis was disproved based upon the first scale, i.e. *fear of sympathy and understanding*. However, the second scale of perspective taking, *degree of perspective taking*, reflected the tendency which could support the hypothesis.

The second hypothesis was tested using a two-factor covariance analysis. By purely comparing the means, it could be said that the hypothesis hold true for the second scale of perspective taking, i.e. *degree to which perspective was taken*. Based on the analysis, there was no significant main effect of giving an apology or not on the three scales of perspective taking, $F(1,189) = 0.02, ns$; $F(1,189) = 2.79, ns$; $F(1,189) = 0.16, ns$. Nevertheless, the means concerning the second scale held on to the first hypothesis. Although the effect was not significant, there appeared to be a tendency towards supporting it. Thus, the *degree* to which the perspective of an ex-prisoner was taken was higher as an apology was stated ($M = 4.74, SD = 0.12$) compared the degree if no apology was stated ($M = 4.48, SD = 0.10$). So the second hypothesis was only partly supported as it held true for one of the three scales concerning perspective taking.

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

The third hypotheses could have been rejected as there was no significant interaction effect found between the membership and giving an apology on perspective taking: $F(1,189) = 0.50$, *ns*; $F(1,189) = 2.90$, $p = .090$; $F(1,189) = 0.94$, *ns*). Nevertheless, the second scale which entails the *degree* of taking perspective showed partially the expected tendency. People were less willing to take the perspective of an in-group ex-prisoner who apologized ($M = 4.47$, $SD = 0.16$) compared to the willingness to take the perspective of an out-group ex-prisoner who apologized ($M = 5.01$, $SD = 0.16$). This tendency was not found in the condition of giving no apology.

Judgement. On a basis of the univariate two-factor covariance analysis it was concluded that there was a significant main effect of apology on one scale of judgment, i.e. *intention and motivation*, $F(1,189) = 41.29$, $p < .001$). People who perceived an apology judged the ex-prisoners *intention and motivation* as more positive ($M = 4.53$, $SD = 0.10$) than people who did not perceived one ($M = 3.65$, $SD = .09$). That was not the case for the second scale of judgment, i.e. *credibility*, $F(1, 189) = 0.54$, *ns*. The membership did not obtain a main effect on either of the two scales. An interaction effect was also not found. Also gender did not have an effect on one of the two scales of judgement, age did on both, $F(1,189) = 4.23$, $p = .041$; $F(1,189) = 6.87$, $p = .009$). There was a positive correlation between the covariate age and judgement (Appendix N). The older the participants were, the more positive were their judgments about the ex-prisoner.

Opinion. The two-factor univariate covariance analysis was used to conclude that there was a significant main effect on apology, $F(1,189) = 9.94$, $p = .002$. This meant that people who received an apology were more likely to have a positive opinion about an ex-prisoner ($M = 4.31$, $SD = 0.09$) than people who were not given one ($M = 3.92$, $SD = 0.09$). A main effect was not found for the membership of the group on the opinion, $F(1,189) = 2.19$, *ns*. There was also no interaction effect between membership and apology given or not on the opinion of the participant over the ex-prisoner, $F(1,189) = 0.90$, *ns*. Another main effect was found of age on the opinion, $F(1,189) = 6.35$, $p = .013$. There was a positive correlation between the covariate age and the opinion about an ex-prisoner (Appendix N). Therefore, the higher the age the

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

more positive the opinion about the ex-prisoner was. A main effect of gender was not found, $F(1,189) = 0.53, ns$.

Distance. According to a two-factor covariance, there was a main effect of giving an apology or not on the first scale of social distance, i.e. *direct environment*, $F(1,189) = 6.27, p = .013$. This means that people who had access to an apology of an ex-prisoner kept less social distance concerning their direct environment ($M = 4.00, SD = 0.13$) than people who did not have access ($M = 4.47, SD = 0.13$). This is not the case for the second scale of distance, i.e. *indirect environment*. Here was no main effect found. For both scales was neither a significant main effect of the membership on the distance nor an interaction effect discovered. Nevertheless, there was a tendency found that distance concerning the *indirect environment* was higher for in-group ex-prisoners ($M = 4.37, SD = 0.15$) compared to out-group ex-prisoners ($M = 3.95, SD = 0.16$), $F(1,189) = 3.86, p = .051$). There was a main effect on age of the *indirect environment* scale, $F(1,189) = 4.40, p = .028$. Thus, the higher the age of someone the lower is the *indirect distance* kept towards ex-prisoners, i.e. a positive correlation between age and the *indirect distance* (Appendix N). Another main effect was found of gender on the *direct environment* scale, $F(1,189) = 7.84, p = .006$. This implies that females are more likely to obtain a greater social distance as it concerns their *direct environment* compared to men (females: $M = 4.05, SD = 1.28$; men: $4.61, SD = 1.31$).

Discussion and Conclusion

In order to decrease the chance of recidivism, it appears to be essential that ex-prisoners lose the label of being criminal to function as a full-valued member of society. The thought process of taking the perspective of someone encourages finding similarities between that person and oneself (Galinsky at al., 2005) which in turn lead to a higher level of sympathy towards that person. The effect of group membership and stating an apology on the willingness to take perspective of an ex-prisoner was examined. It was chosen to look at ex-prisoners because there is not much research done.

Group membership partly influences the willingness to take perspective of an ex-prisoner. The 'black sheep effect' seems to be present to a smaller extent than expected (Marques, Yzerbyt & Leynes, 1988). People are willing to take perspective

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

to a higher degree if the ex-prisoner is part of the out-group. This is because in-group members judge harder upon their own members in order to maintain their positive image. So members who do not act according to their values will be pushed away in order to avoid a generalization of this negative image to the whole group. Conversely, it can be argued that the opposite effect was present as well. In-group members are more resistant to take the perspective of an out-group member compared to an out-group one.

The in-group-leniency effect is an in-group bias which aims to maintain the positive image of the own group. Therefore it assures that the self-image of its members is not affected because it is linked to the presentation of the whole group. So in-group members are judged or punished less harshly than out-group members in order to sustain their positive identity (Pettigrew, 1979). The ultimate attribution error appears to extend this effect and contrasts to the “black sheep effect”. In order to maintain a positive image of the in-group, people tend to ascribe negative attributions to the situation rather than to dispositional factors (Blanz, Mummendey, Mielke, & Klink; Tajfel, 1979). On the other hand, negative images of an out-group member are ascribed to inner traits of that person rather than to the situation. It seems that the effect of group-memberships on perspective taking is influenced by two contrary effects.

This contrast could be a reflection of unaware prejudice towards the out-group. The higher resistance towards perspective taking of ex-prisoners of the out-group could be an indicator. Fehr and Sassenberg (2009) use the principle of “benevolent discrimination” to state that people are motivated to behave without prejudice towards an out-group. However, the in-group acts condescending towards the other group without intending to do so. Plant and Devine (1998) argue that people are internally driven to act non prejudiced because of an egalitarian belief as well as externally motivated because of social pressure. However, Barreto and Ellemers (2005) state that people obtain difficulties to even recognize that they discriminate others by treating them differently than in-group members. So again, they do not seem to be aware of their judgment. Consequently, the unequal intergroup relation is sustained. Monteith (1993) argues that prejudice can only be reduced as people consciously regulate their prejudged responses. So the tendency that in-group members take perspective to a

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

higher degree if it is an out-group ex-prisoner might be a reflection of the attempt to hide those prejudices unconsciously.

Nevertheless, further research needs to be done in order to clarify whether the “black sheep effect” or the ultimate attribution errors turn out to settle the direction. It might be useful to amplify the ex-prisoner’s description in terms of his membership. Exclusively stating that he is either German or Peruvian might be too weak to encourage a strong reaction upon the in- or out-group.

The second independent variable was apologizing or not. The mechanism behind an apology aims to preserve an interpersonal or inter-group relation by resolving a social transgression (Davis and Gold, 2011). Enright et al. (1992) found that resolving a transgression and therefore enhancing forgiveness entails that the violated party will recede from negative feelings such as revenge or retaliation. This study examines whether giving an apology leads to a higher willingness to take perspective of an ex-prisoner and therefore obtain a more positive image of the person. A significant main effect was not found, but the obtained tendency underlines the hypothesis. Giving an apology leads eventually to a higher degree of taking perspective of an ex-prisoner. The image of the ex-prisoner shifts towards a more positive one which weakens the label of being a criminal as well as the overemphasis on being different to the rest of the society.

There could be different reasons for a rather weak correspondence. First of all, the apology is constructed of different elements which arguable enhance the effect each on its own. However, all of the constructs come from different studies. So it appears to be uncertain to what extent they correlate with each other. Moreover, the one component can have different functions in an apology. Eaton and Theuer (2009) found for example that taking responsibility is an essential part of an effective apology. Conversely, Niedermeier et al. (2001) found that taking responsible needs to be accompanied by an account or an explanation for one’s wrong doing. Otherwise the focus is put on the ex-prisoner consciously committed crimes which make his attempts to be reaccepted even more difficult (Exline & Baumeister, 2000). Another potential limitation refers to the formulation of the apology. The components were reproduced in accordance to the studies they were based upon. Not all of those components were originally adjusted to an ex-prisoner’s apology. Some of them

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

focused on re-establishing the relationship between two people. This might contrast to formulations of an apology which is phrased by an ex-prisoner towards society. It is suggested that further research should aim to clarify and identify the formulation of an effective apology. This could be done using qualitative research by asking people to express what they expect of an ex-prisoner's apology.

By looking at the interaction effect between group membership and apology, it seems that the "black sheep effect" can also be used to explain the tendency found. People take perspective to a higher degree if the ex-prisoner is part of the out-group and states an apology compared to an ex-prisoner of the in-group who does. So people seem to be less tolerant towards people of the out-group because they want to preserve the positive image of their own group. This tendency was not observed as the apology was removed. The degree of taking perspective was for both groups equally distributed. So giving an apology seems to be crucial for an ex-prisoner of the out-group to experience a higher degree of taking perspective and therefore a higher level of sympathy (Coke, Batson, & McDavis, 1978).

The judgment of the ex-prisoner's intentions and motivation as well as the opinion about him are found to be more positive if an apology is stated. Darby and Schlenker (1982) explain that the perception of remorse results in reducing negative feelings towards the transgressor. Independently of the willingness to take perspective, stating an apology improves the image of an ex-prisoner.

Social distance measures the degree to which one person accepts the presence of another person in its direct or indirect environment. Stating an apology leads to a lower distance towards ex-prisoners which are in the direct environment of someone. This outcome offers the precondition for Hirschfield and Piquero (2010) findings that ex-prisoner who are part of the direct environment appear to be less threatening and dangerous than those who are not. So re-integrating ex-prisoners seems to be crucial for reducing concerns as well as the label of being an ex-prisoner. The group membership of the ex-prisoner effects social distance as in-group ex-prisoners obtain a larger distance to their indirect environment than towards out-group ex-prisoners. Again the "black sheep effect" can explain this result as in-group members try to distance themselves from members who do not obey their rules and values in order to strengthen their positive self-image.

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

So stating an apology might be one step to enable an ex-prisoner to become a part of society. Although apologies appear to offer a potential to initiate this process, it is left open to what extent it turns to be realizable. It seems unlikely that an ex-prisoner has to apologize for his offences every time he meets someone new. Giving an apology might be appropriate for the direct environment, i.e. friends and families. Actually it could be interesting to see whether of ex-prisoner's direct environment are more likely to take his perspective than people who do not know him. It would be expected that the effect of in- and out-group are reinforced because being part of the family could be functions a stronger distinction between the groups compared to nationality. On top of that it might be important to look at the broader context and improve the negative associations made with ex-prisoners. This might be achieved by helping them to reintegrate and be prepared to respect rules and values of a society. Besides membership there are assumed to be numerous factors which also effect integration and those should obtain attention.

References

- Barreto, M., & Ellemers, N. (2005). The burden of benevolent sexism: How it contributes to the maintenance of gender inequalities. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 633–642.
- Batson, C. D. (1998). Altruism and prosocial behavior. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (2): 282-316. *Boston: McGraw-Hill*.
- Batson, C. D., Polycarpou, M.P., Harmon-Jones, E., Imhoff, H.J., Mitchener, E.C., Bednar, L.L., Klein, T.R. & Highberger, L. (1997). "Empathy and attitudes: Can feeling for a member of a stigmatized group improve feelings toward the group?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 72: 105-118.
- Baumeister, R. (1997). "Evil: Inside human cruelty and violence." *New York*.
- Bijvank, M. (2012). In de schoenen van daders. De invloed van verandingsgezindheid en groepslidmaatschap op perspectief name en beoorderling van daders. *Bachelor Thesis*. (Unpublished).
- Blanz, M., Mummendey, A., Mielke, R., & Klink, A. (1998). Responding to negative social identity: A taxonomy of identity management strategies. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 28, 697-729.
- Brink, E. W. (2012). In de schoenen van criminelen? De invloed van groepslidmaatschap en de ernst van het misdrijf op perspectiefname van daders. *Bachelort Thesis*. (Unpublished).
- Brooks, J., & Reddon, J. (2003). The two dimensional nature of remorse: An empirical inquiry into internal and external aspects. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 38, 1–15.
- Castano, E., Yzerbyt, V., Paladino, M. P., & Sacchi, S. (2002). I belong, therefore, I exist: Ingroup identification, ingroup entitativity, and ingroup bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 135-143.
- Coke, J. S., Batson, C. D., & McDavis, K. (1978). Empathetic mediation of helping. A two-stage model. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 36, 752-766.

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

- Davis, J. R., & Gold, G. J. (2011). An examination of emotional empathy, attributions of stability, and the link between perceived remorse and forgiveness. *Personality and Individual Differences* 50: 392-397.
- Darby, B. W., & Schlenker, B. R. (1982). Children's reactions to apologies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 742–753.
- Darley, J. M., Carlsmith, K. M., & Robinson, P. H. (2000). Incapacitation and just deserts as motives for punishment. *Law and Human Behavior*, 24, 659-683. doi: 10.1023/A:1005552203727.
- Doosje, B., & Branscombe, N. R. (2003). Attributions for the negative historical actions of a group. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 33: 235-248.
- Doosje, B., Branscombe, N. R., Spears, R. & Manstead, A. S. R. (1998). Guilty by association: When one's group has a negative history. *Journal of Personality*
- Eaton, J. & Theuer, A. (2009). Apology and remorse in the last statements of death row prisoners. *Justice Quarterly*, 26 (2): 327-347.
- Enright, R., Gassin, E. A., and Wu, C.-R. (1992). Forgiveness: a developmental view. *Journal of Moral Education*. doi: 10.1080/0305724920210202
- Exline, J. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (2000). Expressing forgiveness and repentance: Benefits and barriers. In M. E. Mc Cullough, K. I. Pargament, & C. E. Thoresen (Eds.). *The psychology of forgiveness* (pp.133-155). New York: Guilford.
- Exline, J. J., Worthington, E. L., Jr., Hill, P., & McCullough, M. E. (2003). Forgiveness and justice: A research agenda for social and personality psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7, 337–348.
- Fehr, J., & Sassenberg, K. (2009). Intended and unintended consequences of internal motivation to behave nonprejudiced—The case of benevolent discrimination. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 39(6), 1093–1108.
- Frank, R. H. (1988). *Passions within reason: The strategic role of the emotions*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton and Co, Inc.
- Galinsky, A. D., Ku, G. & Wang, C.S. (2005). "Perspective-taking and self-other overlap: Fostering social bonds and facilitating social coordination." *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations* 8(2): 109-124.

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

- Giner-Sorolla, R., Castano, E., Espinosa, P., & Brown, R. J. (2008). Shame expressions reduce the recipient's insult from outgroup reparations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44*, 519-526.
doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2007.08.003.
- Gold, G., & Davis, J. (2005). Psychological determinants of forgiveness: An evolutionary perspective. *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations, 29*, 111–134.
- Gold, G. J., & Weiner, B. (2000). Remorse, confession, group identity, and expectancies about repeating a transgression. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 22*, 291–300.
- Harth, N. H., Hornsey, M. J., & Barlow, F. K. (2011). Emotional Responses to rejection of gestures of intergroup reconciliation. *Personality and social psychology bullet.* doi: 10.1177/0146167211400617
- Hirschfield, P., J., & Piquero, A., P. (2010). Normalization and Legitimation: Modeling stigmatizing attitudes toward ex-offenders. *American Society of Criminology, 48*, No.1, (2010), 27- 54
- Hodgins, H. S. & Liebeskind, E. (2003). Apology versus defense: Antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 39*, 297-315.
- Kassin, S. F., Fein, S., & Markus, H. R. (2008). *Social Psychology* (7th edition ed.). Boston: 31. Houghton Mifflin.
- Leach, C.W., Ellemers, N., & Barreto, M. (2007). Group virtue: The importance of morality (vs competence and sociability) in the positive evaluation of in-groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93*, 234-249
- Leach, C.W., van Zomeren, M., Zebel, S., Vliek, M., Pennekamp, S.F., Doosje, B., Ouwerkerk, J.W., & Spears, R. (2008). Group-level self-definition and self-investment: A hierarchical(multicomponent) model of group identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 144-165.
- Lissenberg, E., van Ruller, S., & van Sweningen, R. (2001). Tegen de regels IV. Een inleiding in de criminologie.
- Marques, J. M., Yzerbyt, V. Y., Leyens, J-P. (1988). "The "Black Sheep Effect": Extremity of judgments towards ingroup members as a function of group identification." *European Journal of Social Psychology 18*(1): 1-16.

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

- McCullough, M. E., Rachal, K. C., Sandage, S. J., Worthington, E. L., Jr., Brown, S. W., et al. (1998). Interpersonal forgiving in close relationships II: Theoretical elaboration and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 1586–1603.
- McCullough, M. E., Worthington, E. L., Jr., & Rachal, K. C. (1997). Interpersonal forgiving in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 321–336.
- Miller, A. G., Gordon, A. K., & Buddie, A. M. (1999). Accounting for evil and cruelty: Is to explain to condone? *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3, 254-268.
- Monteith, M. J. (1993). Self-regulation of prejudiced responses: Implications for progress in prejudice-reduction efforts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 469–485.
- Niedermeier, K. E., Horowitz, I. A., & Keer, N. L. (2001). Expectations to the rule: The effects of remorse, status, and gender on decision making. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31, 604-623.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1979). The ultimate attribution error: Extending Allport's cognitive analysis of prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 5, 461-476.
- Proeve, M. J., & Howells, K. (2006). Effects of remorse and shame and criminal justice experience on judgments about a sex offender. *Psychology, Crime, and Law*, 12, 145–161.
- Robbennolt, J. (2003). Apologies and legal settlement: An empirical examination. *Michigan Law Review*, 102, 460-516. doi:10.2307/3595367.
- Tajfel, H. (1979). Individuals and groups in social psychology*. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 18, 183-190.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W.G. Austin & S.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup conflict. In S. Worchel & W.G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Tannenbaum, S. (1983). A Perspective of Human Exposure. *The Lanet*. (Vol. 321, pp. 929-632)

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

- Takaku, S. (2001). The effects of apology and perspective taking on interpersonal forgiveness: A dissonance-attribution model of interpersonal forgiveness. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 141, 494–508.
- Umbreit, M. S., Coates, R. B., & Roberts, A. W. (2001). The impact of victim-offender mediation: A cross-national perspective. *Mediation Quarterly*, 17(3), 215–229.
- United Nations Office for Drugs and Crime (2006). *Handbook on restorative justice programmes*. New York: United Nations.
- van Dijk, W. W., Ouwerkerk, J. W., Goslinga, S., Nieweg, M., & Gallucci, M. (2006). When people fall from grace: Reconsidering the role of envy in schadenfreude. *Emotion*, 6, 156-160. doi: 10.1037/1528-3542.6.1.156. and *Social Psychology*, 75: 872-886.
- Weiner, B., Graham, S., Peter, O., & Zmuidinas, M. (1991). Public confession and forgiveness. *Journal of Personality*, 59, 281-312.
- Worchel (Eds.), *the social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-48). Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole
- Zebel, S., Doosje, B., & Spears, R. (2009). How perspective-taking helps and hinders group-based guilt as a function of group identification. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations* (12): 61-78.
- Zebel, S., Doosje, B., Spears, R., & Vliek, M.L.W. (2010). Tempering a tainted Group history: Group satisfaction moderates perspective taking and reduces group guilt. *Manuscript submitted for publication*

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

worauf sie stolz sein können.

Ich find es angenehm, Deutsche(r) zu sein.

Ich fühle mich angesprochen, sobald es um Deutsche geht.

Ich habe viel mit dem durchschnittlichen Deutschen gemein.

Deutsche sind sich sehr ähnlich.

Deutsche teilen sich viele Gemeinsamkeiten.

Ich ähnele dem durchschnittlichen Deutschen sehr.

Appendix C.

Im folgenden Teil werden Sie gebeten, eine Aussage eines Ex-Straftäters zu lesen und sich in ihn hineinzusetzen. Diese Aussage besteht aus einem Teilausschnitt eines Interviews, das der Ex-Straftäter nach seiner Entlassung gegeben hat. Dieses Interview wurde geführt im Rahmen einer Dokumentation des ZDF zum Thema „Hindernisse auf dem Weg zu einem neuen Arbeitsplatz – Inwieweit trägt der Straftäter dazu bei?“. Hierbei handelte es sich um Ex-Häftlinge, die in Deutschland im Gefängnis saßen und nach ihrer Entlassung Probleme auf dem Arbeitsmarkt erfuhren. Versuchen Sie sich nun vorzustellen, dass Sie dieser Ex-Straftäter sind. Versuchen Sie darauf zu achten, welche Gedanken und Gefühle Sie erfahren während Sie die Aussage lesen.

Nachdem Sie es gelesen haben, werden Sie gebeten mindestens zwei dieser Gedanken und Gefühle aufzuschreiben. Danach werden noch andere Fragen zu der Aussage gestellt. Auch hier gilt, es gibt keine richtigen oder falschen Antworten – es geht allein um Ihre persönlich Einschätzung.

Appendix D.

Martin/Paulo, 26, gebürtiger Stuttgarter:

„Ich saß drei Jahre im Gefängnis und habe meine Strafe komplett abgesessen. Ich wurde verurteilt wegen schwerer Körperverletzung. Ich habe keine abgeschlossene Ausbildung und habe auch nie begonnen was Vernünftiges zu lernen. Nun bin ich vor einigen Monaten entlassen worden und weiß nicht wirklich was ich jetzt aus meinem Leben machen soll. Im Gefängnis hatte ich meinen geregelten Tagesablauf. Ich muss zugeben, dass ich momentan mit den ganzen Freiheiten schon ein bisschen überfordert bin. Es ist echt nicht einfach sich zu motivieren, wenn man so daran gewöhnt ist ständig zu versagen und nie was geschafft hat, worauf man stolz sein kann. Ehrlich gesagt bin ich mir nicht sicher, ob ich jemals einen Job finden werde.“

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

Appendix MTable M1. *Test of Between-Subject Design for Responsibility*

Source	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Apology	1	113.98	.000
Group membership	1	1.64	<i>ns</i>
Apology x Group membership	1	.48	<i>ns</i>
Error	189		

Table M2. *Test of Between-Subject Design for Suffering Emotional*

Source	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Apology	1	100.46	.000
Group membership	1	0.02	<i>ns</i>
Apology x Group membership	1	.93	<i>ns</i>
Error	189		

Table M3. *Test of Between-Subject Design for Suffering Offence*

Source	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Apology	1	38.12	.000
Group membership	1	1.88	<i>ns</i>
Apology x Group membership	1	0.22	<i>ns</i>
Error	189		

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

Table M4. *Test of Between-Subject Design for Empathy*

Source	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Apology	1	18.04	.000
Group membership	1	2.75	<i>ns</i>
Apology x Group membership	1	0.22	<i>ns</i>
Error	189		

Table M5. *Test of Between-Subject Design for Success of Changing*

Source	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Apology	1	7.66	.006
Group membership	1	14.82	.000
Apology x Group membership	1	5.48	.020
Error	189		

Table M5. *Test of Between-Subject Design for Probability to Change*

Source	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Apology	1	14.91	.000
Group membership	1	0.01	<i>ns</i>
Apology x Group membership	1	1.94	<i>ns</i>
Error	189		

TAKING PERSPEKTIVE: EFFECT OF APOLOGIZING AND GROUP MEMBERSHIP

Table M5. *Test of Between-Subject Design for Remorse*

Source	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Apology	1	84.18	.000
Group membership	1	0.32	<i>ns</i>
Apology x Group membership	1	0.80	<i>ns</i>
Error	189		

Appendix N.**Table N1.** *Correlations between Age and Credibility of Judgment, Judgment Intention Motive, Opinion, Indirect Distance*

	Credibility of Judgment	Judgment Intention Motive	Opinion	Indirect Distance
Age	.157*	.146*	.154*	-.143*

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$